Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012

http://archive.org/details/mississippivallev9miss

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

Board of Editors

MELVIN J. WHITE
FRANK H. HODDER
THOMAS M. MARSHALL
CHAUNCEY S. BOUCHER
ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER
CLARENCE E. CARTER
ARTHUR C. COLE
LESTER B. SHIPPEE

Managing Editor

CLARENCE W. ALVORD

VOLUME IX
June, 1922, to March, 1923

Published quarterly by the Mississippi Valley Historical Association

THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

126436

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IX

Number 1. June, 1922

ARTICLES

Propaganda as a source of American history. F. H. Hodder . 3

The political significance of the pension question, 1885-1897. Donald L. McMurry 19

The federal Indian policy in California, 1846-1860. William H. Ellison 37

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A typical "America letter" 68

The Mohegan Indians: a communication 75

BOOK REVIEWS 77

NEWS AND COMMENTS 93

Number 2. September, 1922

ARTICLES

The fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association. Louis Pelzer 103

Religious conceptions of the modern Hurons. William E. Connelley 110

Federal operation of southern railroads during the civil war. R. E. Riegel 126

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Nathaniel Lyon letter 139

An important Swedish source 145

A communication 151

BOOK REVIEWS 155

NEWS AND COMMENTS 177

Number 3. December, 1922

ARTICLES

Nativism in the forties and fifties, with special reference to the Mississippi valley. George M. Stephenson . . . 185

The origin and early history of the farmers' alliance in Minnesota. John D. Hicks 203

The development of industries in Louisiana during the French régime, 1673-1763. Mrs. N. M. Miller Surrey . . . 227
NOTES AND DOCUMENTS
The Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan manuscripts . . . 236
BOOK REVIEWS 242
NEWS AND COMMENTS 260

Number 4. March, 1923

ARTICLES
Old Franklin: a frontier town of the twenties. Jonas Viles . 269
Kentucky neutrality in 1861. Wilson Porter Shortridge . . 283
Céloron de Blainville and French expansion in the Ohio valley. George A. Wood 302
NOTES AND DOCUMENTS
Two westward journeys of John Filson, 1785 320
BOOK REVIEWS 331
NEWS AND COMMENTS 355

INDEX

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW
VOLUME IX

The names of contributors are printed in small capitals. (R) *indicates that the contribution is a review.*

"Age of invention, The," by Holland Thompson, reviewed, 163-164.
"Agricultural bloc, The," by Arthur Capper, reviewed, 335-337.
"Alabama, History of, and dictionary of Alabama biography," by T. M. Owen, reviewed, 87-89.
"Albion W. Tourgée," by R. F. Dibble, reviewed, 247-248.
ALLIN, C. D., (R) Mathews' "The conduct of American foreign relations," 250-252.
"*America letter,*" *A typical* (doc.), by T. C. Blegen, 68-74.
"American democracy, political and industrial, The story of," by W. M. West, reviewed, 174-176.
"American embargo, 1807-1809, The," by W. W. Jennings, reviewed, 162-163.
"American foreign relations, The conduct of," by J. M. Mathews, reviewed, 250-252.
American history, Propaganda as a source of, by F. H. Hodder, 3-18.
"American nationality, The foundations of," by E. B. Greene, reviewed, 337-338.
"American party system, The," by C. E. Merriam, reviewed, 252-253.
"American spirit in education, The," by E. E. Slosson, reviewed, 78-79.
"American spirit in the writings of Americans of foreign birth, The," edited by R. E. Stauffer, reviewed, 245-247.
"Americanization, Aspects of," by E. H. Bierstadt, reviewed, 245-247.
"Americans of foreign birth, The American spirit in the writings of," edited by R. E. Stauffer, reviewed, 245-247.
Annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association, The fifteenth, by Louis Pelzer, 103-109.
"Aspects of Americanization," by E. H. Bierstadt, reviewed, 245-247.
Barce, Elmore, "The land of the Miamis," reviewed, 331.
BARKER, E. C., (R) Stephenson's "Texas and the Mexican war," 77-78.
"Barton, Clara, The life of," by W. E. Barton, reviewed, 331-333.
Barton, W. E., "The life of Clara Barton," reviewed, 331-333.
Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan manuscripts, The (doc.), by M. K. Turner, 236-241.
Beard, C. A., "The economic basis of politics," reviewed, 242-243.
Beard, C. R., and M. R., "History of the United States," reviewed, 170.
BECKER, CARL, (R) Greene's "The foundations of American nationality," 337-338; "The declaration of independence," reviewed, 333-335.
Bell, J. C., Jr., "Opening a highway to the Pacific, 1836-1846," reviewed, 243-244.
Bierstadt, E. H., "Aspects of Americanization," reviewed, 245-247.
BLACK, J. D., (R) Capper's "The agricultural bloc," 335-337; (R) Kile's "The farm bureau movement," 341-342.
BLEGEN, T. C., (doc) *A typical "America letter,"* 68-74.
BOGART, E. L., (R) Thompson's "The age of invention," 163-164.
Bolton, H. E., "The Spanish borderlands," reviewed, 166-167.
BOND, B. W., (doc.) *Two westward journeys of John Filson,* 1785, 320-330.
"Bozeman trail, The," by G. R. Hebard and E. A. Brininstool, reviewed, 338-339.
Brininstool, E. A., and G. R. Hebard, "The Bozeman trail," reviewed, 338-339.
"Bureau of American ethnology, Thirty-fifth annual report of the," part 2, reviewed, 257-259.
California, 1846-1860, The federal Indian policy in, by W. H. Ellison, 37-67.
Capper, Arthur, "The agricultural bloc," reviewed, 335-337.

Céloron de Blainville and French expansion in the Ohio valley, by G. A. Wood, 302-319.
CHADSEY, C. E., (R) Slosson's "The American spirit in education," 78-79.
"Chapters on the history of the Southern Pacific," by Stuart Daggett, reviewed, 159-160.
Civil war, Federal operation of the southern railroads during the, by R. E. Riegel, 126-138.
"Civilization in the United States; an inquiry by thirty Americans," edited by H. E. Stearns, reviewed, 167-170.
CLARK, O. B., (R) Hansen's "Welfare work in Iowa," 161-162.
CLELAND, R. G., (R) Williams' "History of the San Francisco committee of vigilance of 1851," 170-172.
"Colorado, Early records of Gilpin county, 1859-1861," by T. M. Marshall, reviewed, 36-37.
"Commerce, A history of," by Clive Day, reviewed, 337.
"Conduct of American foreign relations, The," by J. M. Mathews, reviewed, 250-252.
CONNELLEY, W. E., *Religious conceptions of the modern Hurons*, 110-125; origin of the modern Hurons, 110-111; removal from Ohio to Kansas, 111-112; author's personal contact with the Wyandots, 112-115; the Wyandots' story of creation, 115-125.
"Constitution, The fathers of the," by Max Farrand, reviewed, 79-80.
"Constitution, The influence of George III on the development of the," by A. M. Davies, reviewed, 164-165.
"Covered wagon, The," by Emerson Hough, reviewed, 160.
COX, I. J., (R) Robertson's "History of the Latin-American nations," 346-347.
"Creek Indians and their neighbors, Early history of the," by J. R. Swanton, reviewed, 257-259.
CUSHMAN, R. E., (R) Beard's "The economic basis of politics," 242-243; (R) Merriam's "The American party system," 252-253.
Daggett, Stuart, "Chapters on the history of the Southern Pacific," reviewed, 159-160.
Davies, A. M., "The influence of George III on the development of the constitution," reviewed, 164-165.
Day, Clive, "A history of commerce," reviewed, 337.
"Declaration of independence, The," by Carl Becker, reviewed, 333-335.
Densmore, Frances, "Northern Ute music," reviewed, 257-259.
Development of industries in Louisiana during the French régime, 1673-1763, The, by Mrs. N. M. M. *Surrey*, 227-235.
Dibble, R. F., "Albion W. Tourgée," reviewed, 247-248.
DODD, W. E., (R) Barton's "The life of Clara Barton," 331-333; (R) "The letters of Franklin K. Lane," 342-345.
Domenica, Angelo di, "Graded lessons in English for Italians," reviewed, 245-247.
DUNN, J. P., *A communication*, 151-154; (R) "Thirty-fifth annual report of the Bureau of American ethnology," part 2, 257-259; (R) Swanton's "Early history of the Creek Indians and their neighbors," 257-259; (R) Densmore's "Northern Ute music," 257-259.
"Early history of the Creek Indians and their neighbors," by J. R. Swanton, reviewed, 257-259.
"Early records of Gilpin county, Colorado, 1859-1861," by T. M. Marshall, reviewed, 86-87.
"Economic basis of politics, The," by C. A. Beard, reviewed, 242-243.
"Education, The American spirit in," by E. E. Slosson, reviewed, 78-79.
"E. H. Harriman," by George Kennan, reviewed, 157-159.
ELLISON, W. H., *The federal Indian policy in California, 1846-1860*, 37-67; Indian policy to 1840, 37-38; problems in California, 38-44; first federal Indian agents, 44-48; treaty-making, 49-59; military reservations under Beale, 60-63; under Henley, 63-65; under McDuffie, 66-67.
"English for Italians, Graded lessons in," by Angelo di Domenica, reviewed, 245-247.
ESAREY, LOGAN, (R) Barce's "The land of the Miamis," 331.
"Farm bureau movement, The," by O. M. Kile, reviewed, 341-342.
Farmers' alliance in Minnesota, The origin and early history of the, by J. D. Hicks, 203-226.
Farrand, Max, "The fathers of the constitution," reviewed, 79-80.
"Fathers of the constitution, The," by Max Farrand, reviewed, 79-80.
Federal Indian policy in California, 1846-1860, The, by W. H. Ellison, 37-67.
Federal operation of southern railroads during the civil war, by R. E. Riegel, 126-138.
Fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association, The, by Louis Pelzer, 103-109.
Filson, John, Two westward journeys of, 1785 (doc.), by B. W. Bond, Jr., 320-330.

"Foreign relations, The conduct of American," by J. M. Mathews, reviewed, 250-252.
"Foundations of American nationality, The," by E. B. Greene, reviewed, 337-338.
Franklin, Old: a frontier town of the twenties, by Jonas Viles, 269-282.
French expansion in the Ohio valley, Céloron de Blainville and, by G. A. Wood, 302-319.
"Geography of the Ozark highland of Missouri, The," by C. O. Sauer, reviewed, 90-92.
"George III, The influence of, on the development of the constitution," by A. M. Davies, reviewed, 164-165.
"Gilpin county, Colorado, 1859-1861, Early records of," by T. M. Marshall, reviewed, 86-87.
"Graded lessons in English for Italians," by Angelo di Domenica, reviewed, 245-247.
"Great war, The Wilson administration and the," by E. W. Young, reviewed, 245-247.
Greene, E. B., "The foundations of American nationality," reviewed, 337-338.
GROSE, C. L., (R) Farrand's "The fathers of the constitution," 79-80.
Hagedorn, Hermann, "Roosevelt in the Bad Lands," reviewed, 156-157.
Hansen, M. L., "Welfare work in Iowa," reviewed, 161-162.
"Harriman, E. H.," by George Kennan, reviewed, 157-159.
HAWORTH, P. L., (R) Howland's "Theodore Roosevelt and his times," 81.
Hebard, G. R., and E. A. Brininstool, "The Bozeman trail," reviewed, 338-339.
HENDERSON, ARCHIBALD, (R) Dibble's "Albion W. Tourgée," 247-248.
Hendrick, B. J., "The life and letters of Walter H. Page," reviewed, 339-341.
"Highway to the Pacific, 1836-1846, Opening a," by J. C. Bell, Jr., reviewed, 243-244.
HICKS, J. D., *The origin and early history of the farmers' alliance in Minnesota*, 203-226; founding of the national alliance, 203-204; early growth in Minnesota, 204-205; financial difficulties of farmers, 205-207; freight rates, 208-211; elevator monopolies, 211-213; grain-grading, 214-215; railway and elevator laws, 1885 legislature, 216-217; railroad and warehouse commission, 218; campaign of 1886, 219-220; legislature of 1887, 220-222; legislature of 1889, 222-223; the *Great West* founded, 223; subsequent legislation in farmers' interests, 224; value of alliance, 225-226.
"History of Alabama and dictionary of Alabama biography," by T. M. Owen, reviewed, 87-89.
"History of commerce, A," by Clive Day, reviewed, 337.
"History of the Latin-American nations," by W. S. Robertson, reviewed, 346-347.
"History of the San Francisco committee of vigilance, 1851," by M. F. Williams, reviewed, 170-172.
"History of the United States," by C. R. and M. R. Beard, reviewed, 170.
"History of the United States, Recent," by F. L. Paxson, reviewed, 84-85.
"Historv of the United States since the civil war, A," vol. 2, by E. P. Oberholtzer, reviewed, 253-255.
HODDER, F. H., *Propaganda as a source of American history*, 3-18; in connection with Columbus, 3-4; English colonization, 4-5; Adams family, 7-8; Oregon, 8-9; Texas annexation, 9; Douglas, 10-12; John Brown, 13; Buchanan, 14; Johnson, 15-16; Woodrow Wilson, 16-18; (R) Bell's "Opening a highway to the Pacific, 1838-1846," 243-244.
Hough, Emerson, "The covered wagon," reviewed, 160.
Howland, Harold, "Theodore Roosevelt and his times," reviewed, 81.
Hurons, Religious conceptions of the modern, by W. E. Connelley, 110-125.
Important Swedish source, An (doc.), by G. M. Stephenson, 145-151.
Indian policy in California, 1846-1860, The federal, by W. H. Ellison, 37-67.
"Influence of George III on the development of the constitution, The," by A. M. Davies, reviewed, 164-165.
"Invention, The age of," by H. Thompson, reviewed, 163-164.
"Iowa, Welfare work in," by M. L. Hansen, reviewed, 161-162.
JAMES, A. P., (R) West's "The story of American democracy," 174-176.
"James K. Polk: a political biography," by E. I. McCormac, reviewed, 248-250.
Jennings, W. W., "The American embargo, 1807-1809," reviewed, 162-163.
Johnson, Amanda, "The Michigan fur trade," reviewed, 172-174.
Jones, C. L., "Mexico and its reconstruction," reviewed, 85-86.
Kennan, George, "E. H. Harriman," reviewed, 157-159.
Kentucky neutrality in 1861, by W. P. Shortridge, 283-301.
Kile, O. M., "The farm bureau movement," reviewed, 341-342.
"Land of the Miamis, The," by Elmore Barce, reviewed, 331.
Lane, A. W., and L. H. Wall, eds., "The

letters of Franklin K. Lane,'' reviewed, 342-345.
''Lane, Franklin K., The letters of,'' edited by A. W. Lane and L. H. Wall, reviewed, 342-345.
''Latin-American nations, History of the,'' by W. S. Robertson, reviewed, 346-347.
''Letters of Franklin K. Lane,'' edited by A. W. Lane and L. H. Wall, reviewed, 342-345.
''Life and letters of Walter H. Page, The,'' by B. J. Hendrick, reviewed, 339-341.
''Life of Clara Barton, The,'' by W. E. Barton, reviewed, 331-333.
''Life of Roger Brooke Taney,'' by B. C. Steiner, reviewed, 255-257.
Louisiana during the French régime, 1673-1763, The development of industries in, by Mrs. N. M. M. Surrey, 227-235.
McClintock, J. H., ''Mormon settlement in America,'' reviewed, 345-346.
McCormac, E. I., ''James K. Polk: a political biography,'' reviewed, 248-250.
McMurry, D. L., *The political significance of the pension question, 1885-1897*, 19-36; importance of the question in the eighties and nineties, 19-20; the soldier vote, 20-21; the G. A. R., 21-23; civil war traditions in the north, 23-25; Washington claim agents, 25-27; relation of the pension to the tariff, 27-28; Cleveland's administration, 28-33; Harrison's administration, 33-35; subsidence of pension interest, 35.
''Maritime history of Massachusetts, 1783-1860, The,'' by S. E. Morison, reviewed, 155-156.
Marshall, T. M., (R) Shaw's ''The University of Michigan,'' 82-83; ''Early records of Gilpin county, Colorado, 1859-1861,'' reviewed, 86-87.
''Massachusetts, 1783-1860, The maritime history of,'' by S. E. Morison, reviewed, 155-156.
Mathews, J. M., ''The conduct of American foreign relations,'' reviewed, 250-252.
Merriam, C. E., ''The American party system,'' reviewed, 252-253.
''Mexican war, Texas and the,'' by N. W. Stephenson, reviewed, 77-78.
''Mexico and its reconstruction,'' by C. L. Jones, reviewed, 85-86.
''Miamis, The land of the,'' by Elmore Barce, reviewed, 331.
''Michigan fur trade, The,'' by Amanda Johnson, reviewed, 172-174.
''Michigan, The University of,'' by Wilfred Shaw, reviewed, 82-83.
Minnesota, The origin and early history of the farmers' alliance in, by J. D. Hicks, 203-226.
Mississippi valley historical association, The fifteenth annual meeting of the, by Louis Pelzer, 103-109.
Mississippi valley, Nativism in the forties and fifties, with special reference to the, by G. M. Stephenson, 185-202.
''Missouri, The geography of the Ozark highland of,'' by C. O. Sauer, reviewed, 90-92.
Morison, S. E., ''The maritime history of Massachusetts, 1783-1860,'' reviewed, 155-156.
''Mormon settlement in Arizona,'' by J. H. McClintock, reviewed, 345-346.
''My brother Theodore Roosevelt,'' by C. R. Robinson, reviewed, 81-82.
Nathaniel Lyon letter, A (doc.), by G. L. Nute, 139-141.
Nativism in the forties and fifties with special reference to the Mississippi valley, by G. M. Stephenson, 185-202.
''Northern Ute music,'' by Frances Densmore, reviewed, 257-259.
Nute, G. L., (doc.) *A Nathaniel Lyon letter*, 139-141.
Oberholtzer, E. P., ''A history of the United States since the civil war,'' vol. 2, reviewed, 253-255.
Ohio valley, Céloron de Blainville and French expansion in the, by G. A. Wood, 302-319.
Old Franklin: a frontier town of the twenties, by Jonas Viles, 269-282.
''Opening a highway to the Pacific, 1838-1846,'' by J. C. Bell, Jr., reviewed, 243-244.
Origin and early history of the farmers' alliance in Minnesota, The, by J. D. Hicks, 203-226.
Owen, T. M., ''History of Alabama and dictionary of Alabama biography,'' reviewed, 87-89.
''Ozark highland of Missouri, The geography of the,'' by C. O. Sauer, reviewed, 90-92.
''Page, Walter H., The life and letters of,'' by B. J. Hendrick, reviewed, 339-341.
Paxson, F. L., (R) Hebard's and Brininstool's ''The Bozeman trail,'' 338-339; (R) Oberholtzer's ''A history of the United States since the civil war,'' vol. 2, 253-255; ''Recent history of the United States,'' reviewed, 84-85.
Pelzer, Louis, (R) Paxson's ''Recent history of the United States,'' 84-85; *The fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association,* 103-109.
Pension question, 1885-1897, The political significance of the, by D. L. McMurry, 19-36.

"Plains and the Rockies, The," by H. R. Wagner, reviewed, 89.
"Polk, James K.: a political biography," by E. I. McCormac, reviewed, 248-250.
Political significance of the pension question, 1885-1897, The, by D. L. McMurry, 19-36.
Propaganda as a source of American history, by F. H. Hodder, 3-18.
Pusey, W. A., "The Wilderness road to Kentucky," reviewed, 89-90.
Railroads during the civil war, Federal operation of southern, by R. E. Riegel, 126-138.
"Recent history of the United States," by F. L. Paxson, reviewed, 84-85.
REID, I. C., (R) McClintock's "Mormon settlement in Arizona, 345-346.
Religious conceptions of the modern Hurons, by W. E. Connelley, 110-125.
RIEGEL, R. E., *Federal operation of southern railroads during the civil war,* 126-138; use of railroads for military purposes prior to the civil war, 126-127; condition of the southern system when taken over by the federal government, 127-128; organization and development of the department, 1861-1864, 128-132; construction and operation, 132-136; cost of military railroads, 136; restoration after the civil war, 136-137.
RIPPY, J. F., (R) Jones's "Mexico and its reconstruction," 85-86.
ROBERTSON, W. S., (R) Bolton's "The Spanish borderlands," 166-167; "History of the Latin-American nations," reviewed, 346-347.
Robinson, C. R., "My brother Theodore Roosevelt," reviewed, 81-82.
"Rockies, The plains and the," by H. R. Wagner, reviewed, 89.
"Roger Brooke Taney, Life of," by B. C. Steiner, reviewed, 255-257.
"Roosevelt in the Bad Lands," by Hermann Hagedorn, reviewed, 156-157.
"Roosevelt, My brother Theodore," by C. R. Robinson, reviewed, 81-82.
"Roosevelt, Theodore, and his times," by Harold Howland, reviewed, 81.
ROOT, W. T., (R) Morison's "The maritime history of Massachusetts, 1783-1860," 155-156.
"San Francisco committee of vigilance of 1851, History of the," by M. F. Williams, reviewed, 170-172.
Sauer, C. O., "The geography of the Ozark highland of Missouri," reviewed, 90-92.
SCHAFER, JOSEPH, (R) Marshall's "Early records of Gilpin county, Colorado, 1859-1861," 86-87; (R) Shortridge's "The transition of a typical frontier," 348-349.
SCHLESINGER, A. M., (R) Becker's "The declaration of independence," 333-335; (R) "Civilization in the United States; an inquiry by thirty Americans," 167-170.
SEARS, L. M., (R) Jennings' "The American embargo, 1807-1809," 162-163.
Shaw, Wilfred, "The University of Michigan," reviewed, 82-83.
SHIPPEE, L. B., (R) Daggett's "Chapters on the history of the Southern Pacific," 159-160; (R) Hendrick's "The life and letters of Walter H. Page," 339-341; (R) Owen's "History of Alabama and dictionary of Alabama biography," 87-89; (R) Steiner's "Life of Roger Brooke Taney," 255-257.
SHORTRIDGE, W. P., *Kentucky neutrality in 1861,* 283-301; results of the election of 1860, 284; position of Governor Magoffin, 285; attitude of Kentuckians toward the Crittenden compromise resolutions, 286; movement for immediate secession, 286-287; union conventions, 287; arguments presented by both sides, 287-289; talk of the formation of a central confederacy, 289; Magoffin's message to the legislature, 289; contest in the legislature, 290-293; border slave state convention, 293-294; policy of armed neutrality, 294-297; results of the elections of 1861, 297; third stage of Kentucky neutrality, 297-300; abandonment of neutrality, 300-301; "The transition of a typical frontier," reviewed, 348-349.
SHURTLEFF, M. C., (R) Davies' "The influence of George III on the development of the constitution," 164-165.
Slosson, E. E., "The American spirit in education," reviewed, 78-79.
"Southern Pacific, Chapters on the history of the," by Stuart Daggett, reviewed, 159-160.
Southern railroads during the civil war, Federal operation of, by R. E. Riegel, 126-138.
"Spanish borderlands, The," by H. E. Bolton, reviewed, 166-167.
Stauffer, R. E., ed., "The American spirit in the writings of Americans of foreign birth," reviewed, 245-247.
Stearns, H. E., ed., "Civilization in the United States; an inquiry by thirty Americans," reviewed, 167-170.
Steiner, B. C., "Life of Roger Brooke Taney," reviewed, 255-257.
STEPHENSON, G. M., (doc) *An important Swedish source,* 145-151; (R) Bierstadt's "Aspects of Americanization," 245-247; (R) Domenica's "Graded lessons in English for Italians," 245-

247; *Nativism in the forties and fifties, with special reference to the Mississippi valley*, 185-202; influx of foreigners, 185-186; growth of nativism, 186-194; Lyman Beecher, 191; antislavery sentiment among immigrants, 195; growth of the republican party, 195-200; George W. Julian, 197-198; James W. Grimes, 198-199; unimportance of nativist terrors, 200-202; (R) Stauffer's "The American spirit in the writings of Americans of foreign birth," 245-247; (R) Young's "The Wilson administration and the great war," 245-247.

Stephenson, N. W., "Texas and the Mexican war," reviewed, 77-78.

STEVENS, W. E., (R) Johnson's "The Michigan fur trade," 172-174.

"Story of American democracy, political and industrial, The," by W. M. West, reviewed, 174-176.

SURREY, MRS. N. M. M., *The development of industries in Louisiana during the French régime, 1673-1763*, 227-235; reports of early explorers, 227-228; market-gardening on the lower Mississippi, 229-230; horticulture, 230-231; wheat-growing, 231-232; corn-growing, 232; rice-culture, 232; cotton-growing, 233; tobacco-growing, 233; indigo-growing, 234; sugar-planting, 234; other miscellaneous industries, 235.

Swanton, J. R., "Early history of the Creek Indians and their neighbors," reviewed, 257-259.

Swedish source, An important (doc.), by G. M. Stephenson, 145-151.

"Taney, Roger Brooke, Life of," by B. C. Steiner, reviewed, 255-257.

"Texas and the Mexican war," by N. W. Stephenson, reviewed, 77-78.

"Theodore Roosevelt and his times," by Harold Howland, reviewed, 81.

"Thirty-fifth annual report of the Bureau of American ethnology," part 2, reviewed, 257-259.

Thompson, Holland, "The age of invention," reviewed, 163-164.

"Tourgée, Albion W.," by R. F. Dibble, reviewed, 247-248.

"Transition of a typical frontier, The," by W. P. Shortridge, reviewed, 348-349.

TURNER, M. K., (doc.) *The Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan manuscripts*, 236-241.

Two westward journeys of John Filson, 1785 (doc.), by B. W. Bond, Jr., 320-330.

Typical "America letter," A (doc.), by T. C. Blegen, 68-74.

"United States, History of the," by C. R. and M. R. Beard, reviewed, 170.

"United States, Recent history of the," by F. L. Paxson, reviewed, 84-85.

"United States since the civil war, A history of the," vol. 2, by E. P. Oberholtzer, reviewed, 253-255.

"University of Michigan, The," by Wilfred Shaw, reviewed, 82-83.

VILES, JONAS, *Old Franklin: a frontier town of the twenties*, 269-282; size and growth of Franklin, 269-271; general plan of the town, 271-272; stores, 272-273; land trading and speculating, 273; manufacturing, 274; labor, 274-275; contacts with the outside world, 275; banking facilities, 275-276; Santa Fe trade, 276; export trade, 276-277; origin of the population, 277; lawyers and doctors, 277-278; prominent men, 278; recreation, 279; militia, 279; the banquet as a community function, 279; observance of law, 279-280; the trustees, 280; teachers, 280; library, 281; newspaper, 281-282; removal of the town, 282.

VIOLETTE, E. M., (R) Sauer's "The geography of the Ozark highland of Missouri," 90-92.

Wagner, H. R., "The plains and the Rockies," reviewed, 89.

Wall, L. H., and A. W. Lane, eds., "The letters of Franklin K. Lane," reviewed, 342-345.

"Welfare work in Iowa," by M. L. Hansen, reviewed, 161-162.

West, W. M., "The story of American democracy, political and industrial," reviewed, 174-176.

"Wilderness road to Kentucky, The," by W. A. Pusey, reviewed, 89-90.

Williams, M. F., "History of the San Francisco committee of vigilance of 1851," reviewed, 170-172.

"Wilson administration and the great war, The," by E. W. Young, reviewed, 245-247.

WOOD, G. A., *Céloron de Blainville and French expansion in the Ohio valley*, 302-319; situation in America after the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, 302, 305; sketch of Céloron, 302-303; Céloron in command of the fort at Niagara, 303; Céloron at Crown Point, 304; expedition to the upper posts in 1748, 305; the French problem in America and La Galissonière's policy, 306-308; Céloron's expedition to the upper Ohio, 310-312; Céloron in command at Detroit, 313-319.

Young, E. W., "The Wilson administration and the great war," reviewed, 245-247.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. IX, NO. 1 JUNE, 1922

PROPAGANDA AS A SOURCE OF AMERICAN HISTORY [1]

It is one of the minor compensations of the great war that it enriched our vocabulary by giving us new words and giving new meaning to old ones. The word *camouflage*, for example, almost unknown before the war, has filled a "long felt want." The word *propaganda* is not a new word. The war did not change its meaning but gave it more meaning than it ever had before. Propaganda may be defined as *ex parte* argument in support of a cause, whether the cause be in the interest of an individual or a family, of a social or a commercial group, of a religious or a political party, of a nation or a group of nations. Propaganda is not necessarily dishonest but it is necessarily one sided and is almost certain to be strongly prejudiced. It is perhaps worth while to review our American history for the purpose of inquiring to what extent propaganda may have been used as a source and may have become a part of it, as it is written.

I do not know what the colleges are teaching about Columbus but I do know that no glimmer of the new light has penetrated the textbooks used in the secondary schools. Mr. Vignaud, in the brief summary of his work in this field which he has recently published under the title *The Columbian tradition*, gives expression to his despair that the truth will ever prevail. The Columbian problem presents two major questions. The first is the authenticity of the Toscanelli letter, which has so long been depended upon as proving the motive of Columbus, and the second, in case the letter be rejected, is what was the motive. It

[1] This address was delivered at the annual dinner of the Mississippi valley historical association, held in connection with the meeting of the American historical association in St. Louis, December 27, 1921.

Adams in time for inclusion in the *Report* but adds that the omission is less serious since the points raised by him were not considered by the court — a statement that will be verified by a comparison of the opinion with Adams' argument as he afterward published it.[4] The Amistad case was won by Roger Sherman Baldwin, a representative of a family distinguished through three generations but one that has been less widely advertised.[5]

The great *History* by Henry Adams appears upon close examination to be an elaborate brief in defense of the political conduct of John Quincy Adams, a defense that he began with the publication of *New England federalism.* Is it possible that so keen a mind as that of Henry Adams would have found in Napoleon's order to seize Texas a proof that it was part of Louisiana, had he not subconsciously desired to substantiate the claim that his grandfather had made? Whoever before found in an order of Napoleon's to seize anything a proof that it belonged to him? The Adams family has produced many very able, if not always amiable, men who have rendered distinguished service to their country, but I cannot help thinking that they have taken themselves too seriously and that they would occupy somewhat less space in our history but for their extensive propaganda.

I can barely allude to the most extraordinary achievement of propaganda in our history and that is the general acceptance of the claim that Marcus Whitman saved Oregon — a claim which Professor Edward G. Bourne and Mr. William I. Marshall disproved twenty years ago but which is nevertheless still rampant in certain sections of the country. In its extreme form the story claimed that Whitman reached Washington just in time to prevent Webster from trading Oregon to Ashburton for a "codfishery" in spite of the fact that Whitman did not visit Washington until the year after the Ashburton treaty was concluded. It is popularly believed, as a result of the campaign slogan "fifty-four, forty," that all of Oregon was in dispute between Great Britain and the United States. Seven times the United

[4] *Argument of John Quincy Adams before the supreme court of the United States, in the case of the United States, appellants, vs. Cinque and others, Africans, captured in the schooner Amistad, by Lieut. Gedney, delivered on the 24th of February and 1st of March, 1841* (New York, 1841).

[5] *Argument of Roger S. Baldwin of New Haven before the supreme court of the United States in the case of the United States, appellants, vs. Cinque and others, Africans, of the Amistad* (New York, 1841).

States had offered to settle the Oregon boundary upon the line of the forty-ninth parallel and as often Great Britain had stood for the line of the Columbia river. We could not therefore reasonably claim anything north of the forty-ninth parallel and Great Britain could not claim anything south of the Columbia. The only part of Oregon really in dispute was therefore between the Columbia and the forty-ninth parallel, and that part of Oregon Whitman never reached.

No issue ever stirred the passions of the American people to such depths as the slavery controversy and as a result no part of our history has been based in so great a degree upon partisan propaganda. It was originally embodied in such books as Wilson's *Rise and fall of the slave power*, which have been extensively used as sources. It was practically the sole basis of von Holst and it reappears in milder form in the pages of Mr. Rhodes. The conventional statement of the economics of slavery was derived from Cairnes's *Slave power*, a book published in England in the early years of the civil war by an *a priori* economist for the purpose of checking the British movement for intervention, and it was not until the recent studies of Alfred H. Stone and Ulrich B. Phillips that its deductions were corrected. The history of the annexation of Texas and the supposed Houston plot was drawn by von Holst from the violently partisan speech that John Quincy Adams made in his filibuster against the first annexation movement.[6] And here let me say parenthetically that I cannot accept the counter doctrine of the Texas school of historians. It does not follow from the fact that slavery was not the cause of the Texan revolution and from the fact that it delayed rather than hastened annexation, that slavery was not nevertheless one of the fundamental causes of annexation.

[6] *Speech of John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, upon the right of the people, men and women, to petition; on the freedom of speech and of debate in the house of representatives of the United States; on the resolutions of seven state legislatures, and the petitions of more than one hundred thousand petitioners, relating to the annexation of Texas to this union* (Washington, 1838).

I do not mean to disparage the antislavery movement but merely to show that the testimony of violent partisans cannot be accepted as conclusive. Professor Allen Johnson has recently shown in his article, "The constitutionality of the fugitive slave acts," in the *Yale law journal*, 31: 161-182, that the charge that the fugitive slave law was unconstitutional was without foundation.

Mr. Rhodes doubtless intended to be impartial but in cases in which he seems to have entertained preconceived opinions or personal aversions he has failed to overcome his prejudices. He is especially unfair in his treatment of Stephen A. Douglas and this is the more difficult to explain since Douglas and Mr. Rhodes' father, Daniel P. Rhodes, were strong personal friends. Douglas frequently visited the elder Rhodes in Cleveland and, although not actually related, the two men called each other cousin.[7] Daniel P. Rhodes supported Douglas for the presidential nomination in 1860; and when Douglas died his estate passed into the hands of Mr. Rhodes as executor and, as it happened, never came out. When Douglas' sons came of age they brought suit against James Ford Rhodes for a settlement of the estate and eventually recovered $30,000.[8] It would be an interesting matter for speculation whether Mr. Rhodes' treatment of Douglas may not have been unconsciously colored by this unfortunate controversy.

I may perhaps be permitted to refer to some of the little things that I have tried to do. The only one that I conceive to be of real importance is the vindication of Douglas from the partisan slander that he repealed the Missouri compromise for the purpose of winning southern support for the presidency and the presentation of his real purpose in its stead. I do not claim that Douglas was altogether blameless, since he used the slavery controversy as a smoke screen to cover his real purpose, which he could not otherwise have accomplished. I regret that I have not yet been able to complete for publication a full statement of all the evidence upon this question. I once briefly summarized the congressional side of it in an address before the State historical society of Wisconsin.[9] Professor P. O. Ray later replied in a paper [10] in which he was very clever at argument but very careless about his facts. As an example of his carelessness I may

[7] Douglas' grandmother married Rhodes' grandfather. Both were second marriages and Douglas and Rhodes were descended from the first marriages.

[8] This information was furnished to me by Douglas' grandson, Martin F. Douglas, esquire, of Greensboro, North Carolina. See N. P. Iglehart, *History of the Douglas estate* (Chicago, 1869).

[9] "Genesis of the Kansas-Nebraska act," in Wisconsin historical society, *Proceedings*, 1912 (Madison, 1913), 69-86.

[10] "The genesis of the Kansas-Nebraska act," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1914 (Washington, 1916), 1: 259-280.

mention his contradiction of my statement that the democratic platform of 1856 contained a plank in favor of a Pacific railway,[11] citing the well known works of Stanwood and Cooper, in both of which, as it happens, in printing the platform that particular plank was omitted. The error would be unimportant were it not significant of Professor Ray's failure to gauge the strength of the movement for a Pacific railroad.

It is sometimes said that it is safer to follow the judgment of Douglas' contemporaries than the new fangled theory of a latter day college professor. But in the first place nothing is more unreliable than the judgment of contemporaries upon issues that become the subject of violent partisan controversy and in the second place some of Douglas' contemporaries knew perfectly well what his real purpose was. Douglas' most intimate political friend was James W. Sheahan, from 1854 to 1860 the editor of his newspaper organ, *The Chicago Times*, and the author of the campaign *Life of Douglas* that was laid upon the desk of every member of the Charleston convention when that body assembled. After Douglas' death, Mr. Sheahan was invited to deliver a memorial address at the old University of Chicago, which Douglas had founded; and in that address, delivered on July 3, 1861, he said:

> In 1850, the compromise bills of that year . . . were passed. California had been acquired, and a road to the Pacific was indispensable. In 1854, the immense tract of territory, now known as Nebraska and Kansas, was closed, by law, to emigration and to travel. Like a huge block, it barred the natural pathway to the Pacific. The South was pressing a railroad from Memphis, and south-westerly across the continent. Mr. Douglas wanted a fair chance to have that railroad lead from the north, where it could find communication through Chicago to the Atlantic. Our railroads had already reached the Mississippi, and others were projected, extending to the Missouri. He wanted Nebraska and Kansas opened, and the country made free to the enterprise of the north. . . That was the motive for organizing these territories —

[11] I said "both platforms," referring to the democratic and republican platforms, as I regarded the whigs as negligible in this campaign. On account of constitutional scruples, the democratic platform referred to the road as a "military and postal road," but Buchanan called it the "Pacific railway" in a letter written during the campaign, in his inaugural address, and in his first annual message. See John P. Davis, *The Union Pacific railway; a study in railway politics, history, and economics* (Chicago, 1894), 72-76.

a motive having its origin in the desire to benefit the whole nation and especially to give the northwest a fair opportunity to compete for the commerce of the great east.

As the corner-stone of this University was laid under an malediction upon the Nebraska bill and its living author, I have thought it not inappropriate that in burying the illustrious dead beneath its monumental towers, a record of the motive should be placed where posterity may find that and the malediction together.[12]

There are some students who are hospitable to the theory that railroad interests prompted the repeal of the Missouri compromise, who nevertheless cannot rid their minds of the notion that Douglas was also bidding for southern support for the presidency or, as they express it, that he was "trying to carry water upon both shoulders." The idea is untenable. If the repeal had been a bid for southern support, he would have proposed it in the first place instead of waiting until his hand was forced by Dixon. By the Kansas-Nebraska act Douglas jeopardized the support of the south, since he would instantly have lost it if his real motive had been discovered.

Another example of the incorporation of partisan propaganda in our history is the statement in practically all of our standard histories and school textbooks that the English bill offered Kansas an exceptionally large grant of land as an inducement to accept the Lecompton constitution. Now the fact is absolutely certain that Kansas was not offered an exceptional grant of land but that the large grant demanded by the ordinance annexed to the Lecompton constitution was cut to the exact amount that was granted to states, before and subsequent to that time, upon their admission to the union, and that this fact was made perfectly clear in the debates on the bill.[13] Here is an easily ascertainable fact that has been misstated for over three quarters of a century. It is entirely different from a question of motive, which is often difficult to ascertain and about which there may be room for difference of opinion.

[12] James W. Sheahan, *Eulogy on Stephen A. Douglas* (Chicago, 1861), 16-18. This address, except for some unimportant paragraphs, was reprinted as "Stephen A. Douglas, an eulogy," in the *Fergus historical series* (no. 15 — Chicago, 1881). The passages quoted occur on pp. 204-206 of the reprint.

[13] F. H. Hodder, "Some aspects of the English bill for the admission of Kansas," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1906 (Washington, 1908), 1: 201-210.

The great posthumous fame of John Brown is partly the product of propaganda and partly the result of accident. There were a number of hot headed abolitionists who went to Kansas territory as correspondents for northern newspapers and whose chief business was to send back sensational accounts of conditions that obtained in the territory. These men were naturally drawn into Brown's camp, partly by their sympathies and partly by their desire for news. Men who are "good copy" are almost always popular with reporters. After Brown's execution, one of these men, James Redpath, published a *Life of Captain John Brown,* which proved a "best seller" during the campaign of 1860. The next important addition to the literature of John Brown was the *Life and letters* published in 1885 by Frank B. Sanborn. Sanborn was an eastern accomplice of Brown's and his book was therefore quite as much a defense of himself as of Brown. Finally there was published in 1910 Oswald Garrison Villard's *John Brown: fifty years after.* Mr. Villard is the grandson of William Lloyd Garrison. Brown was the most conspicuous apostle of Garrison's policy of direct action, and Mr. Villard, in his defense of John Brown may have been not only following the promptings of his heart but vindicating the honor of the family.[14] A brilliant reply to Mr. Villard was written by Hill P. Wilson, unfortunately with too much heat, under the title *John Brown, soldier of fortune; a critique,*[15] which has been almost ignored by historical scholars. Mr. Wilson enjoyed the advantage of a thorough familiarity with the frontier and its type of criminals. In his view Brown was a common horse thief who used the slavery issue as a cloak to cover his nefarious practices. This I know was the opinion at the time of some of the free state leaders who knew Brown personally.

The apotheosis of Brown was undoubtedly worked by the accident of the John Brown song. As is well known, the song was originally composed in jest in order to badger a man of the same name in the Twelfth Massachusetts infantry at Fort Warren;[16] but, being associated in the popular mind with John

[14] I do not mean to impugn the motives of any writer but merely to state circumstances that may have influenced his thinking.

[15] Wilson's book was privately printed in 1913 and published by the Cornhill company, Boston, in 1918.

[16] James Beale, *A famous war song* (printed by the author, Philadelphia [1892]).

Brown of Kansas fame,[17] it became the marching song of the northern armies in the early years of the civil war and resulted in his canonization. There are three possible theories concerning Brown. He may have been an insane fanatic, a misguided patriot, or a common criminal. Whatever the conclusion as to his motives, there is no possible room for doubt as to the result of his activities. He was the source of constant embarrassment to the free state leaders in Kansas and greatly embittered the struggle. The notion that he was the liberator of Kansas is the most absurd pretension ever foisted upon a gullible public. In the country at large the Pottawatomie murders neutralized the advantage that the antislavery party would otherwise have derived from Brooks' brutal assault on Sumner. The attack upon Harper's Ferry greatly widened the breach with the south and rendered a peaceful settlement impossible. If Brown had succeeded in his purpose of precipitating war upon that issue, there can be no doubt that the south would have won and the union would have been destroyed. In Lincoln's phrase: "Among freemen there can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet and they who take such appeal are sure to lose their case and pay the cost."

As Brown was in large part the product of antislavery propaganda, so Buchanan was one of its victims. I hold no brief for Buchanan. He was not an heroic figure with his prayers and his tears, but he did precisely the right thing and the thing that was of greatest advantage to the north in temporizing and postponing the issue until Lincoln's inauguration. The long discussion of compromise, like Wilson's notes to Germany, which were the subject of so much ridicule, was the one thing necessary to convince the people that every peaceable means of settlement had been tried and that there was no alternative but war. It gained time, and the north was in far greater need of time than the south, since it was less united. And finally Buchanan formulated the exact platform which Lincoln adopted in entering upon his administration: he would use the power

[17] Brown is incorrectly called Osawatomie Brown. That designation belonged to O. C. Browne, the founder of Osawatomie. Just as the song, originally referring to another, was transferred to him, so a name belonging to another has also been transferred to him.

confided to him to hold, occupy, and possess the public property and places belonging to the United States.

The greatest sufferer from partisan prejudice in our history is Andrew Johnson. Most people think of Johnson as a drunkard, a belief that was built up on the basis of rumors of his overindulgence while he was military governor of Tennessee and upon the unfortunate circumstances attending his inauguration as vice president. Years afterward William M. Stewart told in his *Reminiscences* a lurid story of the maudlin condition in which Johnson was found the day after Lincoln's assassination, when the committee waited upon him to administer the oath as president. But it happens that two of the men who attended Johnson on that day kept diaries. One was Chief Justice Chase, who administered the oath, who reports that they found Johnson "calm but very grave" and the other was Secretary Welles, who says that at cabinet meeting at noon Johnson "deported himself admirably." Rhodes repeats the common rumor that Johnson was intoxicated at Cleveland on the "swing round the circle." The evidence is, however, conclusive that Johnson learned a lesson from sad experience and was a total abstainer from the day of his inauguration as vice president.[18]

A striking example of injustice to Johnson is the treatment of the Johnson-Grant controversy. In no one of the histories and in no biography of Grant is there any approach to a fair statement of the case. Mr. Rhodes says that "cutting loose from his wiser advisers Johnson proceeded to bungle in characteristic fashion. First he fastened a quarrel upon General Grant. . . . Apparently the source of the misunderstanding was that Johnson believed that he had Grant's promise, in case of the Senate's refusing concurrence in the suspension of Stanton, to hold on to his office and to force Stanton to have recourse to judicial proceedings in an attempt to obtain possession. . . . But there was doubtless some other reason for the quarrel, otherwise it would have broken out on the day that Grant surrendered the office." Professor Burgess says that

[18] Similar charges of intemperance against Webster and aspersions upon his private character originated with radical abolitionists after the speech of March 7, 1850. William C. Wilkinson, *Daniel Webster: a vindication, with other historical essays* (New York, 1911), part second, pp. 95-223.

Johnson "blundered very seriously when he did not accept the explanation of General Grant and drop the matter. . . . He thought that Grant had deceived him and he resolved to have it out with him." Now if Mr. Rhodes and Professor Burgess had read the correspondence with an open mind and any degree of care, they would have learned that Johnson did "drop the matter," that it was General Grant who "fastened the quarrel" and "insisted on having it out" and that the "other reason" for the final breach was Grant's defiance of the president's orders, and that it was not until Grant had sent the infamous letter (drafted in the main by Rawlins, who was trying to make Grant president in order to get the office of secretary of war for himself) in which he said that he had accepted the war office only in order to thwart the president's purposes, that Johnson finally presented the damning proof of Grant's tergiversation. I have selected this particular episode because the evidence is so easily accessible and so clear that he who runs may read.[19]

It is one of the unhappy consequences of war that its partisan slogans ring in the ears and warp the judgment so that men are unable to think straight for generations afterward. The tradition of a "senatorial cabal" is still strong and the echoes of "Hang Jeff Davis" still reverberate, and it is small wonder, under all the circumstances, that gross injustice was done to Andrew Johnson. As it was after our civil war, so is it now in the years following the great world war. It is still too early to fix the direct responsibility for that terrible conflict but we shall not make much progress until we come to realize that all were responsible who created the conditions that made the war possible. From these conditions President Wilson hoped to rescue the world by establishing a new world order. Unable to secure just terms of peace for the vanquished he created the machinery that was intended to readjust the terms as passion cooled and to prevent the recurrence of any such

[19] One would like to think well of Grant. His worst mistakes resulted from devotion to old friends who were unworthy of him. In this case Rawlins paid the penalty by dying of tuberculosis at Washington while secretary of war. Perhaps he might have lived had he accepted the post in Arizona that Grant pressed upon him.

Frederic Bancroft sounded the first note in Johnson's defense in 1885; and John Sherman in 1895 and Horace White in 1913 were candid enough to confess that they had misjudged Johnson and that his plan of reconstruction would have been wiser.

frightful catastrophe. His only alternative was to withdraw from the negotiation and that was not a possible alternative. Had he chosen it, not only would he have abandoned the possibility of saving the world but he would have been overwhelmed by a storm of abuse even greater than was visited upon Andrew Johnson. No one claimed that the covenant of the league was perfect. It would have served, just as our articles of confederation served, until something better could be provided. The important point is that it was a step in advance and by rejecting it we lost ground that it may take a century to recover.

The organization of propaganda against the league went further than it has ever gone before. Not only were Mr. Wilson's character and purposes misrepresented but the larger part of the newspaper press and practically the whole of the periodical and book publishing press were closed to his defense either by formal or tacit agreement.[20] Mr. Wilson fell before the combined attack of the radicals and the reactionaries, just as Lincoln would have fallen but for the military successes of the summer of 1864. There is a brilliant chapter in Professor Cole's volume in the *Centennial history of Illinois* in which he summarizes the criticism of Lincoln in his own state in the campaign of 1864, and the parallel between it and the criticism of Wilson in the campaign against the league of nations is most striking. I asked Professor Cole why he had not drawn that parallel and he told me that he had done so but that he could not get the article published anywhere in the country. The league was defeated by a combination of honest provincialism, narrow partisanship, pro-Germanism, and Sinn Fein. The German vote was the unkindest cut of all, since it was partly for the purpose of securing justice to Germany that the league was devised. There were doubtless narrow minds and timid souls, bound by the traditions of the last century, who were honestly opposed to the league; but what shall we think of the republican politicians who were committed to a league in principle until they saw in its acceptance the danger of a party disadvantage and then betrayed the cause of civilization for thirty pieces of silver?

[20] Doubleday, Page and company appear to have been the only publishers willing to issue books favorable to Wilson. The only exception, so far as noted, is the publication of Creel's *The world, the war, and Wilson,* by Harper and brothers.

And now the present administration is trying to recover an insignificant part of the ground that has been lost with its four-power pact, five-power pact, and all the other power pacts that will be necessary to take the place of the one world pact that we might have had.

In this rapid review I have been able to indicate only a few of the points in which our history has been discolored by propaganda of various kinds. Every age rewrites the history of the past from new points of view, upon the basis of new material and of a revaluation of old material. It is a mistake to think of the science of history, if you call it a science, as old. It is new, newer than most of the sciences. It is only in recent years that there has been any scientific criticism of sources and impartial weighing of evidence. It seems to me clear that there is great need of a thorough reëxamination of the sources upon which our history has been based. This task will devolve upon the rising generation of historical scholars, who will be free from the prepossessions that unconsciously controlled the older writers. And I venture the prediction that when, after the mist of controversy has lifted and the poison gas of propaganda has rolled away, the history of the last decade is written, Woodrow Wilson will rank with Washington and Lincoln as a national hero and in world history will occupy a place not open even to them.

F. H. Hodder

University of Kansas
Lawrence

THE POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PENSION QUESTION, 1885-1897 [1]

The period when the pension question excited the greatest interest in national politics was during the eighties and nineties. This was the time of transition from the declining issues of the civil war and reconstruction to the dominance of newer economic questions. Until these new issues forced themselves upon the attention of the public and of political leaders, local or personal matters held a position of greater prominence than at times when the public was aroused over questions of real national importance. For lack of more worthy competitors the ever-present "pork barrel" attained a position of undue eminence.[2] From this convenient receptacle of the public funds congressmen extracted increasing appropriations for rivers and harbors and public buildings, and much greater amounts for pensioning veterans of the civil war, to the advancement of their own political fortunes and to the disgust of many thoughtful observers.

The confusion in politics at a time when the voting strength of the two main parties was evenly balanced was reflected in the divided party control of the government. During most of this period party measures passed by one house of congress were sure to be killed in the other or to be vetoed by the president.[3] There resulted a relatively large amount of debate that was a mere sparring for party advantage, without expectation that legislation would result from it. In these debates, pensions played an important part.[4] Moreover, the quadrennial change

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at Madison, Wisconsin, April 15, 1921.

[2] Davis R. Dewey, *National problems, 1885-1897* (New York, 1907), 3; Robert M. La Follette, *La Follette's autobiography, a personal narrative of political experience* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1913), 86; James Bryce, *The American commonwealth* (London, 1888), 1: 141.

[3] Frederic L. Paxson, *The new nation* (*The riverside history of the United States*, vol. 4 — New York, 1915), 77.

[4] See Edward Stanwood, *A history of the presidency from 1798 to 1897* (Boston

in the control of the presidency afforded each party an opportunity to investigate and to advertise the misdeeds of the other in the pension bureau.

From 1884 to 1896 the platforms of the national parties showed unusual interest in pensions. During this period, most of the minor parties adopted pension planks. Some of these parties were organized about a single dominant issue, and when they mentioned other subjects it was only those considered most vital. The prohibitionist pension planks were especially significant of the intensity of the issue. If the amount of space allotted to various subjects in campaign textbooks may be taken as a rough indication of their effectiveness in winning votes, pensions were for a time the issue second in importance. In 1884 the republican textbook devoted more pages to pensions and the soldiers than to any other subject except the tariff. This was true of both republican and democratic campaign books in 1885.[5]

The period of the Cleveland and Harrison administrations, therefore, offers perhaps the best opportunity to study the forces that caused the development of the pension system. These forces include: (1) the soldier vote; (2) the Grand army of the republic; (3) the civil war sentiment and tradition that persisted in the north; (4) the Washington claim agents; (5) the soldier press; (6) the pension politicians; and (7) the relation of pensions to the tariff question.

In 1885 there were a million and a half survivors of the union armies, most of them in the northern states.[6] In New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois they were twelve or fifteen per cent of the males of voting age. Only about one-sixth of them received pensions.[7] They constituted a political

and New York, 1898), 419. For an excellent example of this sort of debate, see the debates on the pension appropriation bill, H. R. 5201, in *Congressional record*, 49 congress, 1 session, especially pp. 1792 ff., 1967 ff., 2011 ff., and 2045 ff.

[5] *The republican campaign text-book for 1884* (compiled by George F. Dawson — New York, 1884); *The republican campaign text-book for 1888* (compiled by George F. Dawson — New York, 1888); *The campaign text-book of the democratic party of the United States for the presidential election of 1888* (New York, 1888).

[6] For the statistics upon which these statements are based, see *Report of the commissioner of pensions*, 1890, p. 12; *Congressional record*, 51 congress, 1 session, p. 1797.

[7] About twelve per cent in 1890, assuming that the distribution of the total num-

element that had a distinct class consciousness as a result of certain common interests, prominent among which was the pension question. In a period when elections were decided by small majorities, a voting element of these proportions was enough to cause serious concern among politicians if it could attain reasonable unanimity in regard to what it wanted and if it could make its wants known.

The principal channel through which the wants of the soldiers were made articulate was the Grand army of the republic. The votes of the national encampment of this order showed better than anything else what the comrades of the Grand army and the other soldiers desired. From 1881 on, the Grand army maintained an active lobby through its committee on pensions, which endeavored to procure from congress the legislation advocated by the organization.[8] It was assumed by politicians that the soldier vote could be attracted by the party that made the more liberal grants of pensions, and it seems that a considerable part of it was so attracted.

The Grand army claimed to be a nonpolitical organization. It had strict rules against the use of the order for partisan purposes, and its officers made strenuous efforts to enforce them with at least technical correctness. But the Grand army could not avoid being a force in politics. Its members were voters, and while they did not necessarily cast their ballots in their capacity as comrades, their connection with the order obviously influenced their decisions in many cases when pensions or other matters of common interest to old soldiers were political questions.[9]

ber of ex-soldiers living in these states was in proportion to the distribution of pensioners. *Eleventh United States census, part 1, Population,* 764; *Report of the commissioner of pensions,* 1890, pp. 38-50.

[8] *Journal of the sixteenth annual session of the national encampment, Grand army of the republic, held at Baltimore, Md., June 21, 22, 23, 1882* (Lawrence, Massachusetts, 1882), 871 ff; Robert B. Beath, *History of the Grand army of the republic. With an introduction by Gen. Lucius Fairchild* (New York, 1889), 180-182, 224, 225.

[9] *Ibid.,* 29, 101, 120, 142, 242; Robert B. Beath, *Grand army blue book* (Philadelphia, 1884), 115. The *National Tribune,* January 11, 1883, commenting upon a letter of a correspondent who urged the Grand army to "fill the places of such men as Beck [senator from Kentucky, who is denounced in this paper as a foe of the soldiers] with honest and honorable men, who believe in fulfilling the solemn contract with the savers of this mighty Republic," said: "The Grand army is not

The point is well illustrated by the predicament of Congressman Warner of Ohio, a democrat, who had difficulty in securing reëlection in 1884. He maintained that his troubles were due to the activities of the republican commissioner of pensions, Colonel W. W. Dudley. Colonel Dudley has been described as "a most genial man personally, a brave soldier in the Civil War, who left a leg at Gettysburg," but "an old school politician — and practical." His bent for practical politics led him to take a leave of absence from the pension bureau in the fall of 1884 and to spend two months in Ohio and Indiana managing the republican campaign, using his official influence to accomplish the desired result. Many special examiners from the pension bureau were ordered to Ohio to assist in the work of delivering the soldier vote to the republicans. Democratic applicants for pensions later testified before a congressional committee that they had voted the republican ticket because Dudley's men had given them to understand that their claims would not be allowed if they did otherwise.[10]

Congressman Grosvenor of Ohio claimed that Dudley's activities had nothing to do with Warner's political disaster, but that it was due to Warner's action as chairman of the house committee on pensions, bounty, and back pay. The Grand army committee on pensions had appeared before Warner's committee, and it claimed to have received assurances from him that he favored certain amendments to a bill under consideration which were satisfactory to the Grand army. When the bill was reported, it was not altogether what the Grand army wanted. Grosvenor submitted for printing in the *Congressional record* letters, dated September 8, 1884, from three other members of the G. A. R. committee, General Wagner, General Merril, and Corporal Tanner. Tanner's letter concluded:

> Gentlemen like Mr. Warner must be taught that it is not to prove safe to play with soldiers' interests in the committee-rooms and on the floor of the House.

a political organization, and we trust will never become one; but individual members are at liberty to think and vote as they please, and it would indeed be strange if they did not cast their ballots against those who persistently and maliciously slander them."

[10] La Follette, *Autobiography*, 78; John W. Oliver, *History of the civil war military pensions 1861-1885* (University of Wisconsin, *Bulletin* no. 884, History series, vol. 4, no. 1 — Madison, 1917), 109-116.

Every old soldier in that Congressional district owes it to the large number of his needy and suffering comrades in the country at large who look to us for assistance to make an example of WARNER and terminate his Congressional career now.

Hoping that result will be accomplished and earnestly advising every old soldier to participate in bringing it about,

I am, very truly yours,

JAS. TANNER.[11]

The date and contents of these letters indicate that they were written for use in the election of 1884. It was being realized, as General Benjamin F. Butler told the Grand army in 1890, that if the old soldiers would act together, they could "make politicians dance like peas on a hot shovel."[12] In spite of the earnest efforts of many of the best members to save the order from becoming involved in politics, and in spite of a certain technical conformity to this ideal, the assertion that the Grand army of the republic was in no sense a political organization was entirely misleading.

In 1888 the service pension element that represented the selfish class interests of the soldiers gained control of the Grand army, and from this time on it engaged in exploiting the public esteem for the veterans to obtain largesses from the public treasury. The development of pension activity by the Grand army was contemporaneous with a rapid growth of membership, from 60,678 in 1880 to 269,689 in 1885, and 427,981 in 1890. At the latter date about one-third of the survivors of the war were members. No doubt this growth was caused in part by interest in the increasing activity of the organization in regard to pensions.[13]

[11] *Congressional record*, 49 congress, 1 session, pp. 2045-2046.

[12] *Unofficial proceedings in connection with the twenty-fourth national encampment of the Grand army of the republic, held in Boston, Aug. 11-16, 1890* (Boston, 1891), 205.

[13] *Journal of the fifteenth annual session of the national encampment, Grand army of the republic, held at Indianapolis, Ind., June 15th and 16th, 1881* (Philadelphia, 1881), 761; *Journal of the nineteenth annual session of the national encampment, Grand army of the republic, Portland, Maine, June 24th and 25th, 1885* (Toledo, Ohio, 1885), 51; *Journal of the twenty-second annual session of the national encampment, Grand army of the republic, Columbus, Ohio, September 12th, 13th and 14th, 1888* (Minneapolis, 1888), 190; *Journal of the twenty-fourth annual session of the national encampment, Grand army of the republic, Boston, Mass., August 13th and 14th, 1890* (Detroit, 1890), 19.

The persistence of civil war traditions and sentiments through this period led many citizens other than the soldiers to think and feel in terms of the war as much as the soldiers themselves did. Throughout the northern states a large part of the public believed in giving the veterans what they wanted so far as the means of the government enabled it to do so. Appeals to the soldier vote were all the more effective because of the response to them by other classes of citizens. The feeling that the men who had saved the nation deserved well of the public led not only to liberal grants of pensions, but also to the election of soldiers to office out of all proportion to their numbers. In the forty-ninth congress, elected in 1884, more than a third of the representatives from the northern and border states were union veterans.[14] In such a congress matters of interest to the soldiers were likely to receive plenty of attention.

The effect of the sentimental side of the pension question appeared in the working theory of pension legislation adopted by congress. Congressional orators of the eighties and later were accustomed to assert that the particular laws that they advocated were required to satisfy the terms of a contract made with the soldiers when they enlisted. At the end of the war, so one version of the argument ran, the government had two kinds of creditors: the soldiers, who had risked their lives, and the bondholders, who had risked merely their money. Tables were produced comparing the amounts paid to bondholders with the amounts paid to pensioners, to show that the soldiers had not received their due.[15] This so-called contract had consisted

[14] *Congressional directory,* 49 congress, 1 session. Where the biographies in the *Directory* are incomplete, the *Congressional biographical dictionary* has been used.

[15] In a single session of congress, one form or another of this argument was used by Senator Teller, formerly secretary of the interior, *Congressional record,* 49 congress, 1 session, p. 4504; by Senator Hoar, *ibid.,* 1549; by Senator Blair, *ibid.,* 4460; by Representative William McKinley, *ibid.,* 6024; by Representative Townshend, *ibid.,* 1793, and by others. In the *Report of the commissioner of pensions,* 1885, p. 57, a table is printed to show that the soldiers had been underpaid; since the war they had received less than $800,000,000, while the bondholders had received more than $2,200,000,000. Secretary of the interior L. Q. C. Lamar, referring to this table, said: "So long as the premium paid to those who contributed the money exceeds that paid to the defenders of the country, I think the complaint of excessive pensions is not well founded." *Report of the secretary of the interior,* 1885, in *House executive documents,* 49 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 5, p. 57.

of nothing more than the informal assurances by orators, the press, or other organs of popular expression, that the injured soldiers and the dependents of the slain would be cared for by the government.[16] If the people had made promises, perhaps the people's representatives were under a certain moral obligation to fulfill them, but to call this sort of thing a contract was absurd. The supreme court held that a pension was merely a gratuity which the government might modify or revoke at will.[17] Yet the idea that more and greater pensions were a contractual obligation, or at least that they were necessary to pay the "debt of gratitude" due the soldiers, was so frequently expressed in congress and by so many prominent public men, that it seems to have been the dominant theory upon which congress acted.[18] It was therefore much more important in determining the course of pension legislation than the legal theory was.

The selfish interests of the soldiers who wanted pensions, the kindly sympathy of other soldiers for their unfortunate comrades who needed assistance, and the gratitude of the public to the veterans, were exploited by self-seeking individuals who hoped to profit by additional pension legislation. The claim agents, whose fees depended upon extension of the laws and

[16] President Hayes, in a private letter explaining his reasons for signing the arrears of the pension act of 1879, said: "That act was required by good faith. The soldiers had the pledge of the Government and the people. Congress, State Legislatures, messages, the press — everybody assured the soldier that if disabled in line of duty he would be pensioned." Charles Richard Williams, *The life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes, nineteenth president of the United States* (Boston and New York, 1914), 2:338, quoted in Oliver, *Civil war pensions*, 59-60. See also *Congressional record*, 50 congress, 1 session, p. 3173. If there were any assurances by congress, they must have been of an informal nature. If there had been any that were legally binding, they would hardly have escaped being quoted in the debates of the eighties.

[17] *Digest of United States supreme court reports*, 4483; Walton *v.* Cotton, 19 *Howard*, 355; United States *ex rel* Barnett *v.* Teller, 107 U. S., 64. Senator Blair specifically contradicted the legal theory as follows: "True, it may be said, and often is said, that pensions are a gift, and that they may be conferred, revoked, or wholly refused, even after service rendered or disability contracted while the law specifically provided for them; but no one can seriously claim this, save on the ground that if the nation becomes too poor to carry the burden of taxation, then the obligation may be repudiated; just as in like case the individual is discharged in bankruptcy, so the state may refuse from necessity to pay its debts." *Congressional record*, 49 congress, 1 session, p. 4460.

[18] See Albert Bushnell Hart, *National ideals historically traced* (*The American nation*, vol. 26 — New York, 1907), 281.

upon liberal practices of the pension bureau, worked upon the Grand army and other soldier organizations. They frequently held important offices in the order. They exerted a sinister force upon both legislation and administration. The concentration of large firms of pension attorneys in the city of Washington placed them in a strategic position either to lobby bills through congress or to exert pressure upon officials of the pension office. The largest firm of this kind was that of George E. Lemon. Although Lemon was known to have been concerned in the most unsavory scandals in the pension bureau, and although his activities were repeatedly investigated, he continued his work with impunity. The newspapers published in the interests of the old soldiers were an important element in influencing the soldier vote. They were numerous and of various kinds, but by far the most important was the Washington *National Tribune,* the official organ of the Grand army. It was owned and edited by George E. Lemon, who used it as a means of bringing the veterans to want what was good for the business of the claim agents. Through these means claim agents worked indirectly upon the opinions of the public at large.[19] Political demagogues advocated extravagant pension laws in order to attract the more mercenary part of the soldier vote. They also

[19] Oliver, *Civil war pensions,* 44, 49-50, 99-101. For the investigations by congressional committees involving Lemon, see *House reports,* 48 congress, 2 session, no. 2683; 51 congress, 2 session, no. 3732; 52 congress, 1 session, no. 1868. In 1882 in recognition of Lemon's services in organizing new posts and in helping comrades establish pension claims, the commander in chief of the G. A. R. appointed Lemon his aide-de-camp. *Journal of the seventeenth annual session of the national encampment, Grand army of the republic, Denver, Col., July 25, 1883* (Omaha, Neb., 1883), 223. The *National Tribune* was especially active in having petitions to congress favoring pension legislation sent from G. A. R. posts. See editorials in every number for December, 1884, and January, 1885. It also utilized other soldiers' organizations. In 1887 John McElroy, of the *National Tribune* staff, presided over a meeting of the National association of ex-prisoners of war at Chicago. *Clinton* (Iowa) *Weekly Herald,* September 29, 1887. Senator Vest said that the flood of petitions in favor of pension legislation came not from the soldiers but from the claim agents, and that the military organizations of the country were being used by these "legal cormorants" to make private fortunes and raids on the treasury. *Congressional record,* 49 congress, 1 session, p. 4502. See also *ibid.,* 49 congress, 2 session, pp. 2213-2216; *Harper's weekly,* 31:934; *New York Tribune,* February 8, 1887. The *Grand Army Advocate* (Des Moines) and the *Milwaukee Sunday Telegraph* are examples of local papers published for the benefit of the veterans.

frequently worked up their political fortunes from within the Grand army, as comrades or officers of the organization.

The importance of the pension question was augmented by its relation to the tariff. The presence of a surplus in the treasury encouraged extravagant expenditures. The surplus might have been avoided by a reduction of the taxes, but tariff reformers encountered the opposition of two strongly organized groups, the protected manufacturers and the soldiers. These two sets of interests supplemented each other. If the tariff was kept up, the money had to be spent to avoid hoarding the circulating medium. Pensions were the largest item in the government expenditures, and increases were demanded by an important political element whose support could presumably be bought by the party that was responsible for the larger pension appropriations.[20]

The republican party was strongest in the region that contained most of the protected manufacturers and soldiers. The party naturally felt strongly the sentimental side of the pension question. But the strength of the soldier vote, and the relation of pensions to the tariff when the tariff became the principal issue, explain why the party went so much farther in pension legislation than sentiment alone would have carried it.

The democratic party favored tariff reduction. Northern democrats were embarrassed by a conflict of interests. If they

[20] E. G. Bourne, *History of the surplus revenue of 1837* (New York, 1885), 1-2; Carman F. Randolph, "Surplus revenue," in *Political science quarterly*, 3:234. The reports of the secretary of the treasury show that in every year from 1885 to 1897 pensions were the largest single item in the ordinary expenditures of the government. In 1885 they were eighteen per cent of the total. In 1893, the year which, during the period under consideration, marked the greatest appropriation both for pensions and for all other purposes, they were thirty-five per cent of the total. *Report of the secretary of the treasury*, 1885, p. vi; *ibid.*, 1893, p. xxvii. The ordinary expenditures did not include that part of the surplus applied to the extinguishment of the public debt.

For examples of protectionist speeches on pension bills in congress see *Congressional record*, 49 congress, 1 session, pp. 787, 1797, 1798. The attitude of those interested primarily in pension increases toward reduction of taxes is illustrated by editorials in the *National Tribune*, December 21, 28, 1882, January 20, 1887, May 10, 1888. For statements of the alleged advantages of distributing the surplus among pensioners see *Congressional record*, 48 congress, 1 session, pp. 457, 458; 49 congress, 1 session, p. 4668; *Iowa State Register* (Des Moines), January 2, 1887.

spent money for pensions and so made it more difficult to lower the tariff, they might gain the soldier vote but they would offend tariff reformers. If they reduced the revenues there would be less money for pensions; this would please the "free traders," but offend the soldiers.[21] Although northern democrats did what they could to attract the soldier vote, they worked at a disadvantage, and the republicans derived the greater political benefit from this phase of the pension issue.

Congressmen from the northern states could never remain long unconscious of the pension question because routine work connected with this subject occupied a very large portion of their time. In addition to the necessity of looking up the claims of their constituents before the pension bureau, there was the work of passing special legislation. A newspaper account of the work of the forty-ninth congress, just before the end of the first session, showed that forty per cent of the bills introduced in the house and fifty-five per cent of those introduced in the senate were private pension bills. The business of congress was impeded because the calendars were filled with these bills. They were usually rushed through at poorly attended sessions as fast as the titles could be read, without debate. Many ill-considered acts were passed in this way.[22]

President Cleveland undertook to examine into the merits of these bills so far as possible, and to veto those that he considered

[21] This led democrats to propose various schemes to pay pensions by special taxes, the proceeds of which were to be devoted entirely to this purpose; an income tax was the favorite method suggested. *Congressional record,* 49 congress, 1 session, pp. 789, 2405, 4072, 4675, 6021, 6024.

[22] *Clinton Weekly Herald,* August 5, 1886. Senator La Follette states that during his congressional service he had to spend from a quarter to a third of his time looking up pension cases for old soldiers in his district, not including work on private pension bills. La Follette, *Autobiography,* 84. Congressmen were so burdened with correspondence relating to pensions that many who could afford it hired private secretaries to attend to it. *House reports,* 52 congress, 1 session, no. 1868, p. xx; *New York Herald,* February 7, 1887. In 1907 William P. Hepburn estimated that he had received 50,000 letters relating to pensions during his congressional career. John E. Briggs, *William Peters Hepburn* (*Iowa biographical series,* edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh — Iowa City, 1919), 168. See also *Clinton Weekly Herald,* February 23, April 12, June 14, June 28, September 20, 1888; *Congressional record,* 49 congress, 1 session, p. 4504; *New York Times,* August 7, 12, 1888; *Fayette County* (Iowa) *Union,* April 10, 17, 1888; *A compilation of the messages and papers of the presidents, 1789-1897* (edited by James D. Richardson — Washington, 1896-1899), 8:437.

objectionable. During the first three and a half years of his administration he vetoed 191 and approved 1,369, more than two-thirds as many as had been signed by all his predecessors since 1861. The vetoes were based upon certain definite principles: that private pension acts should conform to the same principles as the general laws, that they were justifiable only in worthy cases lacking in technical proof, that the pension roll should be a roll of honor, unsullied by fraud or by the inclusion of unworthy individuals, and that the decisions of the pension bureau should stand unless there were strong reasons to the contrary. The veto messages can hardly be taken to indicate that Cleveland was hostile or unsympathetic toward the soldiers, but the mere fact of the vetoes led to the charge that he was their enemy. His criticisms of the slipshod methods of congress and his ironical remarks about some of the most flagrant cases aroused unnecessary opposition.[23]

The feeling that Cleveland was the enemy of the veterans was aggravated by the veto of the dependent bill in 1887. This was a proposition to pension disabled and dependent soldiers whether their disabilities originated in the military service or not. It had passed both houses by large majorities, supported by all the republicans, and by the greater part of the northern and border state democrats.[24] The measure aroused unusual opposition from a large part of the republican and independent press as well as the democratic newspapers,[25] and enough northern and border state democrats changed their votes to sustain the veto.[26] This checked, for the rest of Cleveland's term, the movement to distribute the surplus among the soldiers.

[23] *Report of the commissioner of pensions,* 1888, p. 6 ff; *Messages of the presidents* (Richardson ed.), 8: 360, 437, 438, 443, 523, 525, 546; *Congressional record,* 49 congress, 2 session, p. 1639.

[24] *Ibid.,* 742-743, 1076, 1638-1639.

[25] See *Public opinion,* 2:393-397, for a collection of editorial statements about the bill and veto. For newspaper comments opposed to the bill and supporting the veto, see *Chicago Times,* February 12, 1887; *Chicago Tribune,* February, 13, 1887; *Des Moines Leader,* February 18, 22, 1887; *Harper's weekly,* 31: 142; *Nation,* 44: 131, 136; *New York Herald,* February 12, 13, 21, 1887. For adverse criticisms of the veto, see *Iowa State Register,* February 13, 1887; *National Tribune,* February 17, 1887; *New York Tribune,* February 12, 14, 1887; *Philadelphia American,* 13: 275.

[26] *Congressional record,* 49 congress, 2 session, p. 2226. All of the twenty-eight members who changed their votes from yea to nay were democrats. If the size of the vote was an indication of the congressional estimate of the importance of the measure, this was the most important bill during this session of congress. Only

It did not, however, end Cleveland's difficulties with the veterans. The excitement over the dependent bill had hardly subsided when Cleveland issued an order for the return to the southern states of some confederate battle flags that were in the possession of the war department. This raised a tempest of disapproval among those who were still willing to fight the war over again with verbal weapons. The president was threatened with insult if he attended the St. Louis encampment of the G. A. R. and he withdrew his previous acceptance of an invitation to be present. This affair, said the New York *Nation*, "was seized with avidity as the occasion for cursing, but the real cause was the pension veto. It is a question of dollars and cents that stands between the implacables and the President." But there are abundant evidences of sectional feeling in many parts of the north, independent of pensions, which contributed quite as much to the acuteness of the pension question as the vetoes contributed to this prejudice. It is doubtful if a republican president who stood well with the soldiers could have returned the flags in 1887, as Roosevelt did in 1905, without serious opposition. At any rate, the flag episode, so far as it tended to throw the soldier vote into the hands of the republicans, had much the same effect upon the political future of the pension question as the vetoes had.[27]

In the election of 1888 Cleveland was opposed by a soldier candidate who assured the veterans of his esteem. Republican campaign orators like "Corporal" Tanner went about "representing Cleveland as an inhuman monster and Benjamin Harrison as an angel of mercy carrying a purse hanging mouth downward." Tanner said afterwards that he had "plastered Indiana with promises" that more money would be paid out for pensions if Harrison won the election.[28]

eighteen failed to vote yea or nay. On Morrison's motion to reconsider the tariff, there had been nineteen not voting. *Ibid.*, p. 270. In only two other cases was the not voting list less than fifty. This confirms the impression gained from other sources that from the point of view of congressional politics the pension question at times held a place of importance equal to that of the tariff, and above all other subjects.

[27] Donald L. McMurry, "The soldier vote in Iowa in the election of 1888," in *Iowa journal of history and politics*, 18: 343 ff.; *Nation*, 45: 21; James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley, 1877-1896* (*History of the United States from the compromise of 1850*, vol. 8 — New York, 1919), 304.

[28] McMurry, "The soldier vote," in *Iowa journal of history and politics*, 18: 353; *New York Times*, June 19, October 21, 1889; *New York Herald*, October 21, 1889.

The vote in Indiana was expected to be almost evenly divided, and it was in this doubtful state that the pension issue was most emphasized. Some observers thought that the "floating vote," easily amenable to corruption, would determine the result, and that the party that had more two dollar bills would triumph.[29] Others saw another solution of the difficulty, among them General Alvin P. Hovey, a candidate for the governorship, and one of the group of republican politicians who had made the service pension issue the principal means of obtaining their seats in the house of representatives.[30] He explained to a reporter that the soldiers held the balance of power in Indiana. He estimated that there were about 70,000 of them in the state, of whom perhaps 20,000 had voted for Cleveland in 1884, when the republicans had a civilian candidate. But, he inquired, "What can they offer as an excuse for voting for the civilian, the pension vetoer, against a good soldier [in 1888]?" He emphasized the need of a soldier to head the state ticket. At the republican state convention Hovey was nominated on the first ballot, after an orator had described him as the Logan of Indiana, the man

[29] *New York Times,* October 25, 1888; *Chicago Times,* October 2, 1888; *Nation,* 47: 365. It was in this campaign that the former commissioner of pensions, Colonel W. W. Dudley, who had used his bureau as a political machine in 1884, acquired further notoriety as "Blocks of five Dudley" because of a part of his letter to campaign managers in Indiana which read, "Divide the floaters into blocks of five, and put a trusted man with the necessary funds in charge of these five, and make him responsible that none get away and that all vote our ticket." *New York Times,* October 31, 1888; *Chicago Tribune,* November 2, 1888.

[30] At the national encampment of the G. A. R. in 1887, in reply to Hannibal Hamlin's assertion that a service pension was unpopular with the country at large, Comrade Johnston of Indiana said: "I may go into the rural districts . . . and tramp up and down the Wabash valley, taking the soldiers as they come, and nine out of every ten, Democrat and Republican, are in favor of a service pension bill. . . . Let me give you a little piece of history. The gallant Gen. Hovey of Indiana, Captain White of Fort Wayne, and myself represent three districts in Indiana, and in each of these districts the majority against us is twelve to fifteen hundred. We held a Council of War. We declared in favor of a universal pension. Our opponents were foolish enough to fall into the trap and oppose it. Hovey carried his district by fourteen hundred majority, Captain White carried his by over twelve hundred, and I carried mine by eleven hundred and fifty. When I talk, I am talking for the men who represent the rank and file of the Grand Army." *Journal of the twenty-first annual session of the national encampment, Grand army of the republic, St. Louis, Missouri, September 28th, 29th and 30th, 1887* (Milwaukee, 1887), 231-232.

who could "tear the mask from Courtland C. Matson and show the soldiers his hypocrisy."[31]

Colonel Matson, the democratic candidate, was the chairman of the house committee on invalid pensions. Shortly before the democratic convention, while Matson was in Indiana repairing his political fences, one of his friends had reported on his behalf from this committee a substitute for the so-called "Grand army pension bill" that had already passed the senate. The substitute proposed a service pension of a type that had no chance of passing the house. The report that accompanied the bill bore all the earmarks of an economical bid for political support. The bill contained only a limited application of the principle of the per diem service pension, but the report tried to arouse in the soldiers great expectations of future democratic legislation if the principle of the bill were once established. The house then witnessed an auction for the soldier vote of Indiana. Since the state platforms of both parties favored service pensions, the result seemed to depend upon the attitude of the candidates. Matson proposed an expensive measure to pay arrears to pensioners, and Hovey bid almost everything else in the way of extravagant pension legislation that had been thought of at the time.[32]

The difficult dilemma of northern democrats in regard to the pension question now appeared in Matson's predicament, for he had maneuvered himself and his party into an embarrassing situation.[33] The Mills bill for the reduction of the tariff was before the house, and its advocates feared pension expendi-

[31] *Indianapolis Journal*, July 21, August 9, 1888.

[32] *House reports*, 50 congress, 1 session, nos. 1694, 2120; *Congressional record*, 50 congress, 1 session, p. 2969; 51 congress, 1 session, pp. 3171, 4089, 7176, appendix, pp. 378-382; *National Tribune*, April 19, 26, 1888.

[33] The *National Tribune*, May 31, 1888, stated Matson's dilemma very clearly:

"1. He is in favor of the Mills Bill, which proposes to reduce the revenues of the Government to an amount only sufficient to meet actual running expenses.

"2. He has reported the Arrears of Pension Bill, which he says will take $25,000,000 out of the Treasury.

"3. If the Mills Bill passes there will be no money with which to pay arrears of pensions, or any other increase of the pension roll.

"4. If the Arrears of Pension Bill passes first, the reduction of revenue by the Mills bill is simply impossible.

"Now, which bill is he in favor of first?"

tures that would decrease the surplus and the need for tax reduction. Matson's action threatened to put them in a position where they must either endanger tariff reform or vote unequivocally against pension bills.[34] The *Indianapolis Journal* contrasted Matson's promises to the soldiers with his meager record of performance. "As chairman," it said, "he is opposed to pension legislation because of his fear of Grover Cleveland, but as a candidate he is in favor of it all."[35] Hovey had the advantage that his party was in the minority in the house, which enabled him to blame the democrats for the failure to pass his bills. He promised more, with less reserve, and he won the election.

Harrison carried the state of New York, although Hill, the democratic candidate, was elected governor at the same time, a situation that led to the charge that Hill was guilty of a corrupt bargain. But the New York G. A. R. had been especially active in the service pension agitation, and the hostility of the veterans to Cleveland, as Professor Glasson has plausibly suggested, might have accounted wholly or in part for this result. Throughout the north each party made strenuous efforts to prove that it was the better friend of the soldiers, with the advantage in favor of the republicans so far as the more mercenary part of the soldier vote was concerned. It is not at all improbable that enough voters were affected in this way to determine the result of the election.[36]

The republican victory in 1888 brought into power a president and majorities in both houses of congress pledged to do something for the soldiers. Harrison appointed as commissioner of pensions "Corporal" James Tanner, the legless mem-

[34] *Chicago Tribune,* June 5, June 20, 1888. The republicans maneuvered to get Matson's bill considered and make Matson show his hand. Mills was reported to have said that he would rather block the reports of other important committees than allow pensions to come up for discussion.

[35] *Indianapolis Journal,* August 30, 1888.

[36] William Henry Glasson, *Federal military pensions in the United States* (edited by David Kinley, Carnegie endowment for international peace, division of economics and history — New York, 1918), 225; *Journal of the twenty-second national encampment, G. A. R., 1888,* 128, 157, 158; McMurry, "The soldier vote," in *Iowa journal of history and politics,* 18: 351 ff.; *New York Tribune,* October 28, November 4, 1888; *New York Times,* October 5, 30, November 1, 1888; *Indianapolis Journal,* August 3, October 20, 27, 29, 30, November 1, 3, 5, 6, 1888.

ber of the Grand army pension committee. Tanner made the mistake of trying to fulfill campaign pledges literally. The press was soon full of the efforts of this unbalanced enthusiast to convert the pension bureau into a conduit from the treasury to the pockets of the veterans. In spite of criticism and warnings he promised to persevere, although, he said, he might "wring from the hearts of some the prayer, 'God help the surplus revenue.'" His irrepressible talkativeness and his insubordination soon got him into trouble. "What could have been more indiscreet," inquired a former colleague on the Grand army pension committee, "than the style in which he mounted the housetop and summoned the people of the United States to watch him while he made the wheels go round, or while he pulled a string and dangled the Secretary of the Interior at the other end?" He was removed after six months in office, but not until he had done great damage to his party. His successor, whose administration was less noisy and picturesque but in some respects more scandalous, added to the republican embarrassment.[37]

To some reformers Tanner appeared to be only a grotesque personification of certain undesirable elements in his party.[38] A speech by President Eliot of Harvard in October, 1889, was a significant indication of the effect upon thoughtful and independent voters. He gave three reasons for his change from the republican to the democratic party: the republican tariff, the civil service records of Cleveland and Harrison, and the republican record on pensions. In regard to the last he said:

> I hold it to be a hideous wrong inflicted upon the republic that the pension system instituted for the benefit of the soldiers and sailors of the United States has been prostituted and degraded by the whole series of Republican administrations. As things are, Gentlemen, one cannot tell whether a pensioner of the United States received an honorable wound in battle or contracted a chronic catarrh twenty years after the war. One cannot tell whether a

[37] *Public opinion*, 7: 46, 76, 118, 267, 268, 447, 448, 486; *Nation*, 48: 439, 51: 203, 238; *New York Times*, August 3, 4, 10, September 13, October 21, 1889; *Report of the secretary of the interior*, 1889, in *House executive documents*, 51 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 5, pp. 68 ff., 152 ff.; *House reports*, 51 congress, 2 session, no. 3732; 52 congress, 1 session, no. 1868.

[38] *New York Times*, September 12, 13, 1889.

126436

> pensioner of the United States is a disabled soldier or sailor or a perjured pauper who has foisted himself upon the public treasury. I say that to put the pension system of the United States into this condition is a crime against all honest soldiers and against Republican institutions; and it is a Republican administration which has brought that system to this condition, the present administration being the worst of all. . . . Gentlemen, if I had no other motive for changing my party, I would do everything in my power by word and act to get the chance to vote again for Grover Cleveland for President, because he bravely did what he could to restore the pension system of our country to the honorable respect of its soldiers and citizens.[39]

The passage of the expensive pension law of June 27, 1890, made matters worse. It did more to deplete the treasury than "surplus buster" Tanner could have done if he had remained in office.[40] In this act, as in the McKinley tariff, the republicans overshot the mark. There were protests from the same groups that had objected to the dependent bill in 1887. This law and the scandals affected especially the mugwump type of voter. Moreover, the connection between increased pension expenditures and the growing embarrassment of the treasury was obvious. The pension question, as well as the tariff, therefore, was a potent force contributing to the republican defeats of 1890 and 1892.[41]

In the election of 1896, minor parties as well as the major ones still had pension planks in their platforms, perhaps from force of habit; but the press gave no such attention to the subject as it had displayed in 1888, or even in 1892.[42] The period when the public had been most interested centered about the veto of the dependent bill in 1887, the election of 1888, Tanner's brief

[39] *President Eliot's speech at the Bay State club, Oct. 12, 1889* (Boston, 1889), pp. 3-4.

[40] For an account of this law and its operation see William Henry Glasson, "A costly pension law: act of June 27, 1890," in *South Atlantic quarterly,* 3: 361 ff; Edward F. Waite, "Pensions: the law and its administration," in *Harper's new monthly magazine,* 86: 240 ff.

[41] *Public opinion,* 9: 288, 314, 474; 10: 197.

[42] For editorial extracts on the pension question in the election of 1892, see *Public opinion,* 14: 4, 46, 54, 76, 78. The decline of interest in the subject is illustrated by the fact that the indexes to *Public opinion* and the *Nation* for 1896 disclose only a single reference to pensions in each periodical.

but spectacular administration, and the act of 1890. After the panic of 1893 there was no surplus to distribute, and Cleveland was spared the necessity of further vetoes. With the disappearance of the surplus and the emergence of the absorbing free silver question, pensions declined to the position of a minor issue, of more interest to professional vote getters and to the expectant beneficiaries than to the public at large.

Donald L. McMurry

University of Iowa
Iowa City

THE FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY IN CALIFORNIA, 1846-1860

Indian affairs have had a large place in the history of the United States. From the organization of our government almost to the present time the Indian question has involved us in grave political, economic, and moral issues, has necessitated the expenditure of vast sums of money, and has exercised a far-reaching influence upon the character and development of American civilization.

From the first the United States was forced to deal with the Indian question because of the hostility of the Indians and the irresistible pressure against the Indian frontier by whites in search of free land or wealth. The making of treaties with the Indians, by which they were granted the right to occupy certain regions and white persons were prohibited from entrance into these areas, the establishment of trading houses among the tribes, and the introduction among them of "the implements and the practice of husbandry, and the household arts" were some of the methods by which the government tried to make adjustment between the Indians and whites. The United States must be credited with a degree of sincerity in its efforts to deal with the Indian problem in the early years of our history. Some persons even believed, as did Jefferson for a time, that the efforts put forth by the government would tend to civilize the Indians and prepare them to share in the benefits and duties of civil government.

Because of the friction resulting from the eagerness of individuals and states to secure the lands occupied by Indians many persons came to feel, soon after 1800, that the only way to deal with the situation was to separate the Indians and the whites by persuading the Indians to exchange the lands occupied by them for lands somewhere in the west. This plan was first officially suggested by Jefferson, was later stated with more definiteness by Monroe, and was carried out under Jackson and

his successor. This "removal policy" had by 1840 resulted in the erection of an Indian frontier extending from the Red river and Texas to the Great lakes. Many believed that beyond this frontier the United States would not expand.[1]

The new Indian policy had just been put into effect, with the completion of the Indian frontier, when the line of division was broken as a result of the annexation of Texas, the settlement of the Oregon question, the westward migration of the Mormons and the addition of an immense area to the United States by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Through these events the United States became responsible for a large additional Indian population, and Indian treaties were broken by large numbers of people crossing the Indian country on their way to the new lands.

The acquisition of what is now California and subsequent events in the new region, especially the discovery of gold in 1848, added greatly to the burdens and the confusion of federal Indian administration. Changes in the general Indian policy also resulted. The large number of Indians in California, their low stage of development, and their history under Spain and Mexico had much to do with the character of the problems to be faced and the policy to be followed. A brief sketch of the Indian policy of Spain and Mexico in California is therefore in order.

The natives of California when found by Europeans were among the least developed of the Indians in America. There was no agriculture in all their territory. Some hunting and considerable fishing were carried on, but the food of the natives for the most part consisted of acorns, seeds, grasses, roots, and berries. The natives of the northwestern part of the region and those along the Santa Barbara channel were slightly more advanced than those in other parts of the territory, but everywhere there was an almost total lack of anything savoring of culture.

[1] In making this adjustment with the Indians the United States was guided by the principles upon which civilized nations had for a long time based their treatment of uncivilized peoples. These principles were restated and reënforced by decisions of the supreme court, which, while recognizing the Indian tribes as in a sense states with which formal treaties were to be made, regarded the governments of civilized states as having sovereignty over lands and peoples within their jurisdiction. For a full discussion of this subject see Worcester *v.* Georgia, 7 *Peters,* 517-518; Johnson and Graham's lessee *v.* McIntosh, 8 *Wheaton,* 572-583; Cherokee nation *v.* State of Georgia, 5 *Peters,* 1-2; United States *v.* Rogers, 4 *Howard,* 570-572.

There was also no tribal organization as it existed in other parts of the continent. The native groups, of which there were many, were defined and held together by language and by the topography of the country more than by any political or social bonds.[2]

The Spaniards began in 1769 the task of civilizing these unpromising natives of California, numbering, it is variously estimated, from 150,000 to 260,000 before the arrival of the whites.[3] In this year the mission of San Diego, the first white settlement within the present limits of California, was founded. This was followed by twenty other Franciscan missions founded between San Diego and the northern shore of San Francisco by 1823.

For a period of fifty years the missions were from certain standpoints a great success. There were times when they had in their care as many as 21,000 natives, who were taught the rudiments of Christianity, and some of the arts of industry and agriculture. Large numbers of horses, cattle, and sheep were raised at the missions. The yield of grain was said to have reached a total of 180,000 bushels in 1821. Many buildings were constructed by the labor of the Indians. The natives, though unacquainted with the arts and unaccustomed to labor before the missionaries came, did practically all of the manufacturing, weaving, tanning, leather work, milling, soap-making, building, and other work of the industries.

The secularization of the missions, provided for under a *reglamento provisional* passed on August 2, 1834, and practically carried into effect by 1839, undid the work of the faithful missionaries and scattered their protégés. Many of the Indians, unable to readjust themselves to their old way of living, died as a result. Others went into the natives' haunts, whence, joining with the wild Indians, they would come back, frequently with great success, to raid and to steal. Since they were acquainted with the

[2] Much information on the Indians of California is contained in the *Handbook of American Indians, north of Mexico* (Bureau of American ethnology, *Bulletin* no. 30, edited by Frederick M. Hodge — Washington, 1907-1910), Hubert H. Bancroft, *Native races* (San Francisco, 1883), vols. 1, 3, 4, Stephen Powers, *Tribes of California* (Washington, 1877), and *University of California publications in American archæology and ethnology* (Berkeley, 1903-1917).

[3] See A. L. Kroeber, "California, Indians of," in *Handbook of American Indians,* part 1, p. 190; C. Hart Merriam, "The Indian population of California," in *American anthropologist* (new series), 7: 594-606.

country, the missions, and the ranches, they found it easy to drive off horses and cattle into the mountains. These raids, which resulted in much conflict between the Indians and the whites, continued up to and beyond the date of the American occupation.

The occupation of California by the United States on July 7, 1846, had important consequences for the history of Indian affairs in the United States. Indirectly, as has already been noted, it had much to do with breaking the established Indian frontier; and directly, it added to the burdens of Indian administration another Indian problem. This problem was one of rather large proportions and of some difficulty, for, in addition to the complications resulting from the character and previous history of the Indians in California, their number was still large at the beginning of American occupation, in spite of their great losses through pestilence and recent contact with the whites.[4]

There is no way to find out the exact number of Indians in California when the Americans took possession, but the best authorities now agree that it was large. When all available facts are considered it seems safe to say that in 1846 at least 100,000 or perhaps 125,000 Indians inhabited what is now California.[5]

The adjustment between this large body of Indians and the whites, whose numbers were to increase with great rapidity, was

[4] There were serious pestilences of smallpox in 1833, 1837, 1838, and 1844.

[5] Thomas B. King, in his *Report on California* (Washington, 1850), and Henry R. Schoolcraft, in *Information respecting the history, condition, and prospects of the Indian tribes of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1851-1857 — reprinted as *Archives of aboriginal knowledge,* Philadelphia, 1860-1868), have done much to perpetuate too low an estimate of the Indian population of the region by making use of figures given by writers who knew practically nothing about the matter. Statements of value in forming an estimate of the population are found in the following: *Handbook of American Indians* (Hodge ed.), part 1, p. 190; Merriam, "Indian population of California," in *American athropologist* (new series), 7:594-606; Hubert H. Bancroft, *History of California* (*History of the Pacific states of North America,* vols. 13-18 — San Francisco, 1884-1888), 3: 357-358, 4: 73, 648; Governor McDougall to President Fillmore, March 1, 1851, in *Senate executive documents,* 32 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 1, p. 138; L. Lea from George W. Barbour, O. M. Wozencraft, and Redick McKee, March 5, 1851, from R. McKee, March 24, 1851, from Adam Johnston, January 30, 1852, from E. F. Beale, November 22, 1852, *ibid.,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 62-63, 67-69, 242, 379; Beale to G. W. Manypenny, August 22, September 30, 1853, *ibid.,* 33 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 1, pp. 467, 472; *Report of the commissioner of Indian affairs,* 1856, p. 246.

not made without difficulty. Here, as in practically every other part of the United States where the whites took possession of lands occupied by, or in proximity to, the Indians, the government had a dual task. On one hand, it had to guard the whites who pressed in upon the territory against outrages by the Indians; on the other, it had to protect the Indians against the rapacity and cruelty of the whites.

The intention to fulfill this task was evidenced in two proclamations issued by the military authorities in California immediately after the Americans took possession. One of these documents proclaimed that "The California Battalion of Mounted Riflemen will be kept in the service of the Territory, and constantly on duty to prevent and punish the aggressions by the Indians or any other persons upon the property of individuals or the peace of the Territory." The other was a proclamation in the district of San Francisco ordering the release of all Indians held to service against their wills, but providing that those having chosen their own employers were to abide by their contracts unless they should be given permission in writing to leave or unless the magistrate should annul the contract. By this order also the Indians were prohibited from wandering about the country in an idle and dissolute manner, and if so found they were liable to arrest and punishment by labor on the public works at the discretion of the magistrate.[6] The proclamations were an assertion of sovereignty by the United States over the Indians and the territory occupied by them, and might be criticized on purely sentimental grounds; but the policy indicated was to prove a godsend to the whites and some protection to the Indians themselves.

The Indians were a source of great annoyance to the early white settlers in California because of their continued depredations, in which they drove off large numbers of horses and constantly endangered the safety of persons in the settlements. These marauding expeditions, which were the scourge of the

[6] The first of these documents was issued on August 7, 1846, by R. F. Stockton, commander-in-chief of the military forces and governor of California. See the *California Star*, January 9, 16, 23, 1846. The second was a public order of John B. Montgomery, in military command of the district of San Francisco. See *ibid.*, February 20, March 6, 1847.

whole country from Sonoma to San Diego, called the military forces into frequent service.[7]

In spite of these difficulties, General Kearny, who became governor of California on March 1, 1847, believed that conciliatory methods could be used effectively in dealing with the natives. Accordingly, he recommended that presents should be given the Indians as a means of maintaining peace. In addition to adopting this measure, on April 7, 1847, by virtue of authority vested in him as military governor of the territory, he appointed John A. Sutter subagent for the Indians on and near the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers; and on April 14 he appointed Mariano G. Vallejo to the same office for the Indians on the north side of the bay of San Francisco. These agents were instructed to secure information concerning the Indians in their districts, to establish local regulations with the approval of the governor, and to regard themselves as protectors of the Indians. Evidence is abundant that these agents and the military governor did much to see that justice was done the Indians and that peace was maintained.[8]

The efforts of the federal authorities to maintain peaceful relations in the country resulted in only partial success. Depredations by the Indians continued, and the military force was

[7] Walter Colton, *Three years in California* (New York, 1854), 25, 29-31; *California Star,* March 13, 20, April 10, 17, 1847; unbound documents, manuscript archives of California, 1846-1850, in the Bancroft library, Berkeley, California, pp. 146-147, 168-169; the *Californian,* August 15, 1846, p. 4, August 22, 1846, p. 11, September 26, 1846, p. 37, December 26, 1846, p. 96. The *Californian,* a weekly, was the first newspaper published at Monterey. It continued publication from August 15, 1846, to May 6, 1847. An abstract of the paper, which makes a large volume of manuscript, is in the Bancroft library, where it is listed as *Cal. MSS.* no. 72.

[8] Mariano G. Vallejo, Documentos para la historia de California, tomo 1, p. 23, tomo 12, p. 281, in the Bancroft library; Major Hardie to Vallejo, July 26, 1847, *ibid.,* tomo 12, p. 308; General Kearny to W. T. Marcy, April 28, 1847, in *Senate executive documents,* 31 congress, 1 session, no. 18, p. 275; *ibid.,* 175; Kearny to Vallejo, W. T. Sherman to J. D. Hunter, August 1, 1847, Governor Mason to Lieutenant Anderson, to John A. Sutter, August 16, 1847, to Vallejo and Sutter, August 19, 1847, to L. W. Boggs and Vallejo, November 11, 1847, H. W. Halleck to Vallejo, September 15, 1847, circular letter of Halleck, August 16, 1847, *ibid.,* 285, 332, 334-335, 356-359, 360-361, 370-371, 396; Sutter to Kearney, March 18, May 27, 1847, Mason from Captain Folsom, August 15, 1847, from Boggs and Vallejo, October 30, 1847, in unbound documents, manuscript archives of California, 1846-1850, pp. 86-87, 90, 124-126, 175; John A. Sutter, Personal reminiscences, 42, in the Bancroft library; Sutter to Mason, July 12, 1847, in *California Star,* July 24, 1847.

inadequate for the situation. The result was that Lieutenant Sherman, through Alcalde Burton of San José, authorized persons to shoot Indians caught stealing horses. Likewise, a general order went into effect on November 1, 1847, directing all persons having Indians in their service to give every Indian employed or hired a certificate to that effect. Indians found wandering about without such certificates were to be arrested and punished as horse-thieves. Wild Indians and Indians not employed who wished to visit settlements for the purposes of trade were required to secure passes from the Indian subagent of the district.[9] These measures, it will be seen, bear close resemblance to the black codes of the south. If they would seem to make atrocities against the Indians possible and to be harsh and discriminatory, it must be remembered that the character and the conduct of the Indians gave some justification for the methods used in dealing with them.

While the Indians brought much trouble upon themselves, the evil of drunkenness among them was wholly the fault of the whites. An honest effort, which met with only partial success, was made to remedy this evil. A proclamation was issued on November 29, 1847, making anyone who in any manner disposed of liquor to Indians liable to severe punishment, and providing that in cases of prosecution Indians were to be held competent witnesses. Alcaldes and Indian subagents were directed to carry the provisions of the proclamation into effect. Vigorous action was demanded against all violators of the law and numbers of persons were prosecuted with rigor.[10]

Questions of property ownership involving the rights of Indians and others to lands were called to the attention of the military authorities on various occasions during the years 1847 and 1848. General Kearny and his successor, Governor Mason, desired to maintain the *status quo* of the missions and the mission lands until proper legal tribunals should determine their

[9] Halleck to Vallejo, August 16, 1847, Lieutenant Sherman to John Burton, September 6, 1847, in *Senate executive documents*, 31 congress, 1 session, no. 18, p. 358; *California Star*, September 18, 1847.

[10] Vallejo, Documentos para la historia de California, tomo 12, pp. 319, 324; *Senate executive documents*, 31 congress, 1 session, no. 18, p. 413; Mason to Colonel Stevenson, to I. Callaghan, June 11, 1848, to W. R. Longley, June 16, 17, 1848, Halleck to P. C. Carrillo, July 20, 1848, *ibid.*, 539-542, 547-548.

ownership and the rights of Indians in relation to them. It was held by the authorities that the law of secularization gave the Indians lands for their own use, but that they could not in any way dispose of the lands and that all sales of mission property made by them were void. The question of the right of Indians to own and to sell or lease lands outside the missions was disposed of by Mason with a statement to Sutter and Marshall, who sought a sanction for the lease of lands from Indians on the American fork of the Sacramento river, that the United States did not recognize the right of Indians to sell or lease the lands on which they resided.[11]

With peace secured between Mexico and the United States, steps were taken toward some permanent and general policy for the administration of Indian affairs in the new territory. On July 17, 1848, congress asked for a report as to the number of Indians in Oregon, California, and New Mexico. On November 30 the commissioner of Indian affairs reported that the acquisition of California and New Mexico had increased the number of Indians in the United States and that this would require the appointment of additional agents for the proper management of affairs of the department; and on December 5 the president in his message to congress recommended the appointment of a suitable number of Indian agents for the territory.[12]

On April 3, 1849, George W. Crawford, secretary of war, notified General Persifer F. Smith, commanding the Pacific division of the army, that the proper officers for the management of Indian affairs in California had been appointed and would repair with convenient dispatch to the scene of their labors. On the same day the secretary of state gave instructions to Thomas Butler King, who had been appointed by the president to study conditions in California and to secure information concerning

[11] *Californian,* March 27, 1847, p. 169; *Senate executive documents,* 31 congress, 1 session, no. 18, p. 430; Mason to J. M. Bonilla, November 30, 1847, to the commanding officer at San Francisco, February 5, 1848, Halleck to Colonel Stevenson, July 25, 1848, *ibid.,* 413-414, 448, 552-555. In this letter Halleck gives a summary of all the decrees in his possession relating to the missions of California since their secularization. For Governor Mason's letter to J. A. Sutter on the right of Indians to own or to lease land see *ibid.,* 466.

[12] *House executive documents,* 30 congress, 2 session, no. 76, pp. 1-5, 11-12; *ibid.,* no. 1, pp. 407-408.

the natives there. The commissioner of Indian affairs gave a commission on April 7 to John S. Wilson as Indian agent at "Salt Lake, California," and on April 14 to Adam Johnston as Indian subagent on the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. On July 15 William Carey Jones was sent to California under instructions from the secretary of state and the secretary of the interior. He was directed specifically to study land titles, but as part of his duties he was to make inquiry into the nature of Indian rights as existing under the Spanish and Mexican governments, to indicate from authoritative data the difference between the privileges enjoyed by the wandering tribes and those enjoyed by the tribes who had made actual settlements, and to report their general form, extent, and locality, together with the manner in which such rights had been recognized.[13]

While these officials were preparing to take up their respective duties in California, changes which had an important bearing on the Indian question were taking place in that region with great rapidity. Gold had been discovered in the previous year, and in 1849 tens of thousands of people poured into the country. Indians were crowded from their accustomed haunts, hostilities were frequent, and the military problem became a serious one because soldiers deserted to go to the mines. Governor Riley made the best distribution of troops that seemed possible, but he was not able to prevent injustice to the Indians, retaliation on their part, and consequent bitter feelings.[14]

[13] *Senate executive documents,* 31 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 1, p. 157; William C. Jones, *Report on the subject of land titles in California* (Washington, 1850), 3; John M. Clayton to T. B. King, April 3, 1849, W. Medill to John Wilson, April 7, 1849, to Adam Johnston, April 14, 1849, in *Senate executive documents,* 31 congress, 1 session, no. 18, pp. 9-11, 97-98, 409-410. On November 17, John A. Sutter was notified of his appointment as Indian subagent on the Sacramento river. Adam Johnston was directed to give his services to the valley of the San Joaquin. See *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, p. 4. Sutter appears to have been receptive at first, but he evidently changed his mind, for on May 23, 1850, he declined the appointment and Johnston took over the duties of his district. *Ibid.,* 115.

[14] The correspondence concerning these occurrences and developments is so voluminous that it is impracticable to give the references here.

The attitude of the people of California toward the Indians, which grew in part out of the hostilities between natives and immigrants as the immigrants crowded the Indians from their sources of food supply, should be noted in this place. The convention which drew up the constitution for California after a long debate

The men who were appointed to various offices in California reached the field and took up their work in the summer and fall of 1849.[15] William Carey Jones examined the question of land titles and made his report under date of April 10, 1850. The only part of his report having direct bearing on this study is the section dealing with the nature of Indian rights to the soil under the Spanish and Mexican governments. He found that "In the wild or wandering tribes, the Spanish law does not recognize any title whatever to the soil." But with respect to other Indians he learned that it was a principle laid down in the Spanish colonial laws that the Indians should have a right to as much land as they needed for their habitations, for tillage, and for the pasturage of their flocks.[16]

The report of Thomas Butler King, dated March 22, 1850, was communicated to congress by the president on March 26. While King devoted a portion of his space to Indian affairs, the report had no great importance for Indian administration. Little that he said regarding Indians was based on first-hand information, and the figures given have no reliability whatever. King did observe correctly that the number of Indians had greatly declined since earlier days. Remains in all the valleys of the Sierra Nevada and along the foothills of that range gave indications that at no remote period there must have been a numerous population where none existed at the time of his investigation.

and much shifting of position by various delegates denied to Indians the right to vote, but a proviso was added to the effect that nothing in the law should be construed to prevent the legislature by a two-thirds vote from admitting Indians or their descendants to the right of suffrage. *Report of the debates in the convention of California on the formation of the state constitution in September and October, 1849* (edited by J. Ross Browne—Washington, 1850), 7, 61-74, 305-308, 458, appendix, iv. The first legislature of the state passed an act for the government and protection of the Indians which provided that "in no case shall a white man be convicted of any offense upon the testimony of an Indian, or Indians," which made the Indians subject to many forms of punishment for petty offenses, which recognized their possessory rights to lands but provided for their dispossession by an easy process, and which created for certain Indians under age a wardship that made possible something akin to slavery. *Statutes of California,* first session, pp. 408-410. See also *Journals of the California legislature,* first session, pp. 3, 224, 257, 333-334, 337, 366-367, 369, 384, 575, 1284.

[15] Nothing further need be said concerning John Wilson, for by the settlement of the eastern boundary of California along the ridge of the Sierra Nevada his agency was excluded from California.

[16] Jones, *Report on land titles in California,* 32-34.

Many of the Indians seen by him were of the lowest grade of human beings, with little inclination to work or to improve their condition. They had never pretended to hold any interest in the soil, nor had they been regarded by the Spaniards or by the American immigrants as possessing any. It was King's opinion, and this may have influenced to some extent the policy of the administration, that it might be possible to collect the Indians together and to teach them in some degree the arts of civilization.[17]

Adam Johnston, whose services in the Indian affairs of California were of more importance than those of any other person of the period, began his active work in the spring of 1850. The results of his observations were set forth in several reports made to the Indian department. By September 16 he had visited many tribes of Indians and had noted their low stage of development. That they were declining in numbers seemed to him apparent on every hand. The fact that they were being crowded out of their old homes by the rapid incoming of the immigrants, and thus were being deprived of their accustomed food supply, led him to recommend that at various points depots should be established for the distribution of supplies.[18]

The suggestion of King, referred to above, that the arts of civilization might be taught to the Indians if they were collected together, seems to have been the first official suggestion for the concentration of the California Indians. Adam Johnston believed that supplies ought to be systematically distributed to the Indians to compensate them for their losses. The military officials evidently had similar ideas, for, in a report to the war department, General Riley recommended that as far as practicable the Indians of California should be concentrated in districts over which the United States should have exclusive jurisdiction.[19]

Partly as a result of definite suggestions from the civil and military officials in California and partly because of a desire to act for the best interests of both Indians and whites, but with little understanding of the situation in that remote region, con-

[17] *House executive documents*, 31 congress, 1 session, no. 59, pp. 1, 2, 6-8.

[18] Johnston to O. Brown, March 1, July 6, September 6, 1850, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 37, 41-43, 45.

[19] *Senate executive documents*, 31 congress, 1 session, no. 52, pp. 56-57.

gress passed, and the president approved on September 28, 1850, "An act to authorize the appointment of Indian agents in California." On September 30 a measure became law appropriating $25,000 to enable the president to make treaties with the various Indian tribes in California.[20]

Redick McKee of Virginia, George W. Barbour of Kentucky, and O. M. Wozencraft of Louisiana were appointed as Indian agents, or commissioners, under the laws passed by congress; and as early as possible they set out for the field of their labors. Dr. Wozencraft reached San Francisco on December 27, Colonel McKee on December 29, and Colonel Barbour on January 8. The commissioners decided to act collectively for a time, though their instructions permitted them to work separately, and John McKee, son of Redick McKee, was chosen secretary of their body.

On January 14 the agents went to the capital at San Jose to consult with the governor and to secure information from the members of the legislature about Indian troubles in their respective districts. They found the governor and the legislature much concerned by reports of Indian depredations in various parts of the state. As a result of the excitement a bill was passed by the legislature authorizing a loan not to exceed five hundred thousand dollars to be used in case of war to repel invasions or to suppress insurrections. Another act provided for the payment of liberal salaries to officers and soldiers who had previously aided in putting down uprisings. Still another authorized the governor to call out troops to defend the frontier and provided liberally for their compensation. It was expected that the state would be reimbursed by the federal government for all expenditures called for under these acts.[21] These mili-

[20] *Statutes at large and treaties of the United States of America, from December 1, 1845, to March 3, 1851* (Boston, 1851), 519, 544-559.

[21] *Senate executive documents*, 31 congress, 2 session, no. 1, part 1, pp. 28-29, 41-42; *ibid.*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 46-48. When the agents were about ready to set out for California it was discovered that by some oversight no appropriation had been made to pay their salaries. But provision had been made for paying three commissioners for services in behalf of the Indians of California. To avoid delay it was decided to appoint the same persons commissioners who had been nominated and confirmed as agents. These commissioners made report immediately on their arrival in California. See *ibid.*, 53-54. The attention of the depart-

tary provisions would have been none too great if the governor's statement that there were one hundred thousand warriors in the state had been true.

Early in February the commissioners set out for the Indian country in the San Joaquin valley. They were accompanied by a military escort of the United States army under the command of Captain E. D. Keyes. The company went to Stockton, then up the San Joaquin valley to the Mariposa river. After much effort, six tribes of Indians were assembled at the commissioners' camp, where on March 19 the first treaty was arranged for the United States with the Indian tribes.

By the treaty the jurisdiction of the United States over the Indians and over lands occupied by them was jointly recognized, provisions and beef cattle were promised in abundance to the Indians, and it was agreed that all cases of dispute between Indians and white men were to be adjudicated by the civil authorities. The Indians in agreeing to the treaty provisions relinquished all title to lands claimed by them. In return for such relinquishment a large tract of land between the Merced and Tuolumne rivers was set apart for their exclusive occupancy. As soon as the treaty had been concluded the Indians left for the reservation under the charge of Redick McKee and Adam Johnston.[22]

The commissioners now proceeded south. By April 14 they had established themselves at Camp Barbour on the upper San Joaquin river and were successfully persuading many Indians

ment was called to the high cost of living in California with the hope that congress might be induced to raise the commissioners' salaries.

Some reports of Indian troubles were well authenticated. See *Message of the governor,* January 7, 1851, in *Journals of the California legislature,* second session, 793-796; also see *ibid.,* 40, 51, 59-60, 68, 72, 563-565, 878-879, 941-944, 946, 1368. The various acts passed are in *Statutes of California,* 1851, pp. 402-403, 489-491, 520-521.

[22] Lea from R. McKee, February 11, 1851, from Barbour, McKee, and Wozencraft, February 17, March 25, 1851, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 54-58, 69-71; *Message of the president of the United States communicating eighteen treaties made with Indians in California, 32 congress, 1 session* (Washington, 1905), 44-47. This document was published under order of the senate in executive session, January 19, 1905. The injunction of secrecy was not removed from these treaties and other documents belonging with them until the day before, January 18. This document will be referred to in what follows as *California treaties,* 1851-1852.

to meet with them there. On April 29 a formal treaty was made with sixteen tribes, or bands. Promises were given in the treaty to supply the Indians with food and equipment, and a large tract of land was set apart as another reservation.

The agents evidently relied much on a full stomach as a guarantee of peace, for they stated that experience had taught that the best way to keep the Indians in California quiet was to give them plenty of food. In order to supply this necessity, the commissioners considered themselves under compulsion to make liberal promises under the head of "subsistence." The department was advised that this course must be pursued throughout the state for, according to the commissioners' view, "it is *cheaper* to feed the whole flock for a *year* than to *fight* them for a week." [23]

Adam Johnston did not entertain the same feelings of optimism concerning the effects of treaty-making as did the other officials; he believed that Indian depredations would continue in spite of the treaties. He knew of many whites, too, who, having lost property or friends at the hands of the natives, had declared their intention of shooting them on sight, whether treaties were made or not, and he thought the establishment of a line of military posts along the valley of the San Joaquin, with an Indian agent at each one, would be the most effective means of meeting the problem.[24]

The original instructions of the commissioners permitted each to adopt a separate course of action. On their arrival in

[23] *Journal of the United States Indian commissioners for California,* April 12, 15, 19, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 90-97. For a period the commissioners kept a chronological record of their activities. This will be referred to as *Journal of the commissioners.* For the treaties see *California treaties,* 1851-1852, pp. 47-49. On May 1 the commissioners reported their movements and acts to the Indian department. It was stated that 600 or 700 Indians were residing in the reserve between the Tuolumne and the Merced rivers. It was expected that this number would be increased to 1000 or 1200 when the *monas* or wild Indians should come in. At the second reservation 711 Indians were counted. It was reported that these would probably increase to 2000 or more. The commissioners optimistically asserted that the two treaties had broken the confidence of the hostile tribes in their ability to contend with the whites. McKee, Barbour, and Wozencraft to Lea, May 1, 1851, in *Senate executive documents,* 31 congress, 1 session, no. 1, p. 486.

[24] Johnston to Lea, March 3, April 11, June 24, 1851, *ibid.,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 63-67, 72-74, 105.

California, because of their slight knowledge of the country and of their problem, they had deemed it wise to act as a joint board for a time. It was later decided, however, to divide the country among them, and on May 1 the division was made. In the drawing of lots for districts "the northern district, or that portion of the State north of 40° or 41° of latitude, until it reaches the headwaters of the Sacramento, fell to McKee. The middle district, extending from San Joaquin on the south to the head-waters of the Sacramento, and east of the coast range to the eastern boundary of the State, fell to O. M. Wozencraft. The southern district, extending from the San Joaquin south and west, and east to the state boundary, fell to G. W. Barbour."

With the division arranged, on May 3 Wozencraft, McKee, and John McKee left Camp Barbour for San Francisco. On their arrival in that city they were disappointed at finding no remittance of funds as expected. Their disappointment was increased when they read in a paper that Lea's estimate of money needed for their purposes had been cut from $75,000 to $25,000 by congress, a procedure which McKee characterized as an egregious blunder, the result of which would be to handicap him and his colleagues greatly in their undertaking.[25]

Barbour entered upon the duties of his district in the south as soon as the division of territory was made. As rapidly as possible he brought Indian tribes together and made treaties with them similar to the two already made. In each case a large tract or tracts of land were set apart as Indian reservations. On May 13 a treaty was made on King's river with twelve tribes or bands of Indians; on May 30 one was arranged with seven tribes on the Kaweah river; on June 3 another was made with four tribes on Paint creek; and on June 10 another was concluded with eleven bands at Tejon Pass.[26]

From Tejon Pass Barbour went on to Los Angeles, but he was disappointed to find on his arrival that no money was contained in the letter which awaited him from McKee. Because of his

[25] *Journal of the commissioners,* April 19, 30, and May 1, 1851, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 91-92, 97-98; R. McKee to Barbour, May 13, 1851, *ibid.,* 81.

[26] Barbour to Lea, May 14, July 28, 1851, *ibid.,* 81, 122-123; *California treaties,* 1851-1852, pp. 10-16, 19-21.

lack of funds and of the great difficulty of crossing the desert, he gave up his plan to go to the Colorado river, and dispensed with practically all of his military escort. He then made arrangements to visit and treat with some tribes below Los Angeles, but before he started south news reached him of a threatened outbreak of Indians in the Tulare valley and thither he went instead in the last part of June. By inducing the trespassing miners to leave the reservations, by holding friendly talks with the Indians, and by making assurances to them that the beef promised would soon be supplied, he secured a fair degree of satisfaction among the natives.[27]

From the Tulare valley Barbour went on to San Francisco. On his arrival there on July 28 he found a letter from the department advising him that only $25,000 had been appropriated for the Indian work in California and that as soon as this sum was expended the commissioners were to confine themselves solely to their duties as agents. Since he had been unable to make his intended trip to the Indians below Los Angeles because no funds were available for it, and since things were moving along harmoniously in the valley under Johnston, Barbour decided to go to Washington and to visit his family in Tennessee. Accordingly on October 4 he left San Francisco for the trip east.[28]

[27] Barbour to E. D. Keyes, June 17, 1851, to Lea, July 28, 1851, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 125-126, 128.

Great supplies of beef were promised to the Indians in connection with every treaty made. On May 28 when the treaty was being arranged at Camp Keyes, Barbour completed a contract with John C. Frémont to supply the beef promised to the Indians in the southern part of the state. This contract was without authorization from Washington, and Frémont understood that it was subject to the approval or rejection of the authorities there. Frémont proceeded to supply the beef cattle according to the contract. By Barbour's instruction some of the cattle were delivered to the different Indian tribes and some 1900 to Barbour on the San Joaquin river. Barbour turned these over to Adam Johnston. At the request of Frémont, Barbour drew drafts on the secretary of the interior for $183,825 when he received the cattle. See Barbour's report to Lea (not dated), received at the Indian office February 2, 1852, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 258-259; Frémont to Barbour, May 19, 1851, Barbour to Frémont, May 28, 1851, Johnston's receipt for cattle, August 28, 1851, *ibid.*, 267-268; Hayes collection, Indians, vol. 2, no. 4, in the Bancroft library. This last is a collection of scrapbooks containing both printed and manuscript materials, but made up chiefly of newspaper clippings.

[28] Report of Barbour to Lea, February 2, 1852, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, p. 260.

It has already been stated that Johnston did not consider the making of treaties an effective method of dealing with the California Indians. Nevertheless, it became necessary for him as Indian subagent to coöperate in making some of the treaties and to assume responsibility for certain reservations after the treaties had been made. The greater part of his services were given to the southern, or Barbour's district, although some of his time was spent north of this region. Johnston's work resulted in the accumulation of large claims against the United States, for he took upon himself the responsibility of furnishing greater supplies of beef than were stipulated in the treaties. The delivery of the beef was placed in the hands of traders whom he licensed for the respective reservations. Furthermore, he employed a physician, Dr. W. M. Ryer, to visit the Indians and vaccinate them, relying upon the government to pay in the future for Dr. Ryer's time and skill.[29]

Johnston did commendable work for the Indians and made valuable reports to the department; but by reason of his subordination when the commissioners entered upon their duties in California, he became dissatisfied. By the end of the summer of 1851 his position had grown almost intolerable to him. He was unable to get help from the military authorities in forcing unlicensed traders and other intruders from the reservations, friction developed between him and Wozencraft, and he was left without funds to carry on his work. The result of all this was that he not only failed to report regularly to the Indian department, but carried on the business of his agency in a desultory manner. As a consequence he was relieved of the office, notice of his dismissal being sent to him by Lea under date of January 9, 1852.[30]

Wozencraft, who with McKee arrived in San Francisco on May 8, began immediately to make preparations for a journey into the central district. Before his arrangements were completed he was advised by McKee, as the disbursing officer, that, in view of the very limited appropriation made by congress,

[29] Report of Johnston, June 24, 1851, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 104-105.

[30] Johnston to General Hitchcock, August 4, 1851, to the commissioner of Indian affairs, October 8, 1851, to A. H. H. Stuart, December 4, 1851, to Lea, February 25, 1852, Wozencraft to Lea, December 1, 1851, Lea to Johnston, January 9, 1852, *ibid.*, 24, 196, 200, 229, 233-234, 293.

it would be inexpedient for the commissioners personally to incur any large financial responsibility or by their actions to implicate the Indian department until congress should provide adequate funds.[31]

Wozencraft left San Francisco for the Indian country on May 24. As rapidly as possible he made treaties with many tribes of Indians and, like the other agents, set apart large reservations for them. His first treaty was made on May 28 with six tribes of Indians who met at Dent and Vantine's ferry on the Stanislaus river; the next was concluded with ten tribes at Camp Union on the Yuba river; another was made on August 1 with nine tribes of Indians near Bidwell's ranch on Chico creek; five tribes entered into a treaty at Reading's ranch on August 16; eight tribes made a treaty at Camp Colus on September 2; and four tribes on the Consumnes river entered into a treaty on September 18. After the treaties were made, an addition of some twelve tribes was made to the reservation near Chico. Wozencraft expected, according to his statement, which partook of his characteristic exaggeration, that eventually as many as 75,000 or 80,000 Indians would be included in the provisions of the six treaties. While traveling and making these compacts, the agent was piling up heavy claims against the United States, for the estimate of the amount required to fulfill the stipulations contained in the several treaties reached the sum of $346,138.[32]

In addition to those in the central district, two reservations were set apart by Wozencraft for Indians in southern California. When Colonel Barbour left for the east, he asked Wozencraft to take charge of his district in his absence. During the months of November and December reports reached Wozencraft of Indian trouble in the south, and in particular among those tribes whom Barbour had failed to visit below Los Angeles. With a military escort, therefore, Wozencraft left on December 8 for the scene of the trouble. The Indians were found in a warlike attitude, but quiet and confidence were soon restored. On January 5 a treaty was made with three of these tribes and two days later

[31] R. McKee to Wozencraft, May 13, 1851, Wozencraft to Lea, May 14, 1851, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 80, 83-84.

[32] R. McKee to Lea, May 29, 1851, Wozencraft to Lea, May 28, September 30, October 14, 1851, statement of O. M. Wozencraft, *ibid.*, 84, 86, 133, 187-190; *California treaties*, 1851-1852, pp. 22-37.

one was concluded with the Diegan Indians. The territory set apart for the use of these tribes embraced a large area.[33]

Redick McKee's journey into the northern district was delayed until August 11, because funds failed to arrive from Washington. He was able to start when he did because Collector King advanced him $5,000 on a draft against the department. His escort on the expedition was a company of dragoons under Major W. W. Wessels. The party proceeded north by way of the Russian river country, Humboldt river on the coast, Klamath river valley, and Scott's valley, where the journey ended.

With various tribes of Indians McKee made treaties of the same general character as those negotiated by Barbour and Wozencraft. The first one was made with eight tribes at a camp near Clear lake on August 20, and another, with four more tribes in the same general region on August 22. On October 6 a treaty was arranged on the South fork of the Trinity river with the lower Klamath, upper Klamath, and Trinity nations. On November 4, after locating a reservation site in Scott's valley — though with great difficulty because of the objections of the settlers — McKee concluded a treaty with three nations who resided severally in twenty-four, nineteen and seven *rancherias* or villages.[34]

On December 29, the day after his return to San Francisco, McKee made a report to Washington on his activities in the north. Now, as at other times, he indicated a desire to make a temporary return to Washington, but the department did not

[33] Wozencraft to Lea, December 1, 3, 1851, undated, received at Indian office February 18, 1852, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 229-230, 285-287; Wozencraft, Statement on Indian affairs, pp. 8-13, manuscript in the Bancroft library; *California treaties,* 1851-1852, pp. 38-43. Wozencraft's work practically ended with the making of these treaties. At this time and later he was involved in controversy with McKee. He also became involved in differences with the Indian department, especially after the appointment of a superintendent of Indian affairs for California.

[34] John McKee, *Minutes,* in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 134, 141-142, 144-145, 161-162, 170-177. A daily record of the trip north was kept by John McKee, son of Redick McKee and secretary of the commissioners. R. McKee to T. B. King, T. B. King to R. McKee, July 11, 1851, *ibid.,* 118-120; George Gibbs, "Journal of the expedition of Colonel Redick McKee, United States Indian agent, through north-western California," in Schoolcraft, *Indian tribes of the United States,* 3: 106-112, 166-173; *California treaties,* 1851-1852, pp. 52-53, 59-60, 65-67.

consider that the public interest would be promoted by his presence at the capital and virtually ordered him to remain in California.[35]

The services of McKee from this time to the end of his relations with the department in the early part of 1853 were less expensive to the government than those formerly rendered, but they were likewise of slight practical value. Some of the time he spent with little success in defending the treaties before the legislature and in the press, but the greater part he spent in controversies with the military authorities over the way in which meat had been furnished to the Indians on the expedition north, with Governor Bigler and members of the legislature over the blame for difficulties between Indians and whites in the northern part of the state, and with Superintendent Beale over the question of their relative authority.[36]

The chief work of Barbour, Wozencraft, and McKee had been the negotiating of treaties with the Indians of California. In

[35] R. McKee to Lea, December 29, 1851, January 15, 31, 1852, Lea to R. McKee, February 4, 1852, John McKee, *Minutes*, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 25, 178-180, 235-236, 239, 248-249.

[36] The dispute with the military authorities grew out of the charges made against McKee by army officers, who alleged that supplies were furnished to the Indians in a careless and criminal way. The business connection of John McKee with those who furnished the supplies complicated the matter. From the evidence in the case it appears that John McKee's relation to the sale of the beef was injudicious, but not criminal; that McKee's general plan for handling the supply matter was unwise; that General Estelle of the state militia, who sold most of the beef to the government, was not guilty of wrong doing; and that General Hitchcock of the United States army had a desire for orderliness in methods, and was a jealous military man with an ear for gossip. For material bearing on this dispute, see *House executive documents*, 34 congress, 3 session, no. 76, pp. 67-68; *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 24-25, 27, 298-299, 300-308, 347-355.

The controversy between McKee and the state officials resulted from reports of hostilities in the northern part of the state. McKee charged that the whites were to blame, and the governor and members of the legislature supported the other side. United States military forces were finally provided for that region. *Ibid.*, 310-326, 353, 364; *Journal of the senate of California*, 1852, pp. 304, 703-708, 710-711, 721-723; O. C. Coy, The settlement of the Humboldt bay region, 163, manuscript in the Bancroft library.

The difficulty with Beale which ended McKee's services in California was caused by McKee's disappointment that Beale and not himself was appointed superintendent of Indian affairs in California. McKee proved a problem for Beale, and his services came to an end as a result of insubordination and the controversy in which they became involved. See *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 33, 308, 324, 364-366, 372-373, 381-389.

all, 18 treaties were made by them, affecting 139 tribes or bands. It is not possible to state with accuracy the number of Indians included in these tribes, but it is safe to say that there were not fewer than 25,000. Only a fraction of this number, however, was ever taken to the reservations. The reservations set apart for the Indians included a total of 11,700 square miles, or 7,488,000 acres of land.[37] This vast space is equal to the combined areas of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island, or to about that of the present counties of Fresno, Alameda, Sacramento, and San Diego in California, or to seven and one-half per cent of the total area of the state.

The government of the United States had authorized the commissioners to make treaties with the Indians of California, and had appropriated $50,000 for their use in doing so. This they consumed as they had a right to do. In addition they let contracts for supplies and incurred other expenses which amounted to nearly one million dollars. As to the latter points, it is difficult to say to what extent they were justified in their action. Certainly they had no authorization to commit the government in the way they did, but they defended their action on the ground that it was necessary under the circumstances.

To make these treaties effective their ratification in Washington was necessary. The sentiment in California with reference to the treaties, divided from the first, grew increasingly hostile as time went on. The main objection was to giving the Indians such large areas of valuable land. The subject of the treaties was taken up early in the session of the legislature of 1852, where intense opposition was manifested. The assembly passed resolutions condemning them and asking for their rejection by the United States senate. The senate voiced its opposition in much hostile discussion and by a section in a memorial on the subject of the public domain of California.

By February 18, 1852, when the last of the treaties had been received in Washington, officials of the interior department were aware that violent opposition had developed against the treaties in California and that the California delegation in congress was solidly against them. L. Lea, the commissioner of Indian

[37] This statement is made after a careful calculation based on the description of the reservations contained in *California treaties*, 1851-1852.

affairs, and Edward F. Beale, the newly appointed superintendent of Indian affairs for California, were in favor of their ratification. Secretary Stuart, in submitting the treaties, together with a mass of documents, to the president on May 22, was noncommittal.

The eighteen treaties were submitted to the senate by the president on June 1. On June 7 the president's message accompanying them was read in the senate and, with the treaties and accompanying documents, was referred to the committee on Indian affairs. The treaties were next considered in secret session of the senate, and all were rejected by that body. While the reasons for the action of the senate do not appear in the records, it is quite certain that the main causes for the defeat of the treaties were the methods of the commissioners in piling up immense claims against the United States, and the violent opposition to the treaties in California because they removed such large areas of land from public and private use. Senator Weller of California at a later time said: "Public policy demanded that these treaties should be rejected." [38]

The treaties had been rejected, but they left a disagreeable aftermath. The question of the disposition of the claims against the United States growing out of the work of the commissioners came up in congress as early as March 26, 1852, when an amendment to the deficiency bill was proposed appropriating $520,000 toward their liquidation, but no action was taken at this time. The next step was on April 6, when the senate called upon the department of the interior for information on the subject. In return, a statement of claims amounting to nearly $800,000 was received. The question came up several times during the remainder of the session, but still nothing was done.[39]

Most of the claims were never paid because of prejudice against them and evidence of fraud in many cases. One of the claims allowed was that of John C. Frémont for $183,825. A bill providing for the payment of this claim, with interest from

[38] *California treaties,* 1851-1852, pp. 1-8; *Congressional globe,* 32 congress, 1 session, part 3, pp. 2103, 2172.

[39] *Ibid.,* 880-890, 2104; *ibid.,* 33 congress, 1 session, part 2, p. 1335, part 3, pp. 2103-2110; Lea to W. R. Graham, April 13, 1852, W. A. Graham to W. R. King, April 14, 1852, in *Senate executive documents,* 32 congress, 1 session, no. 61, pp. 1-3. See also many miscellaneous documents, *ibid.,* pp. 2-26.

June 1, 1851, was approved by the president on July 29, 1854. A claim of Wozencraft for the reimbursement of $7,000 expended by him in the course of his duties was paid in July, 1856. In 1860 Samuel J. Hensley was paid $96,375 for beef furnished to the Indians. The payment of other claims, although discussed from time to time, was never made. The whole question was finally disposed of in 1871 without further adjustment.[40]

On March 3, 1852, an act creating a California Indian superintendency became a law. On the day following Edward F. Beale was appointed to the newly created office. Appropriations were made to meet the expenses of the superintendency and an additional appropriation of $100,000 was made for the purpose of preserving peace with the Indians who had been dispossessed of their lands, until arrangements could be made for their future settlement.[41]

On September 16 Beale reported his arrival in San Francisco, and he at once made a tour into one part of his field. From what he saw and heard he became convinced that some definite Indian policy was immediately necessary for California. On October 29 he reported to the department that he was maturing a plan which was "recommended alike by its practicability, humanity, and economy," which he would be prepared to develop fully after his proposed visit to the south. In brief, the basis of what he would propose was outlined as follows:

> In the first place I propose a system of "military posts" to be established on reservations, for the convenience and protection of the

[40] Edward F. Beale investigated some of the claims and found that much fraud had been practiced. See *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 368-370; 32 congress, 2 session, no. 57, pp. 1-5.

For action on the claims of Frémont, Wozencraft, and others, see *United States statutes,* 33 congress, 1 session, *Private acts,* 80; *ibid.,* 34 congress, 1 session, *Private acts,* 31; *ibid.,* 36 congress, 1 session, *Private acts,* 15; *Congressional globe,* 34 congress, 1 session, part 2, pp. 1369, 1461, 1575; *ibid.,* 36 congress, 1 session, part 2, pp. 1001, 1277, 1503, 1524, 1557, 1575, 1832, part 3, p. 2607; *Senate reports,* 36 congress, 1 session, no. 111, pp. 1-5; *House reports,* 35 congress, 1 session, no. 133, pp. 1-2; *Report of the commissioner on Indian affairs,* 1857, pp. 10-11; *ibid.,* 1871, pp. 17-18, 153-154.

[41] Lea to Beale, August 2, 1852, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, p. 38; *United States statutes,* 32 congress, 1 session, pp. 2-3, 18, 55. The appropriation for the expenses of the superintendency was only about one-fourth of what Beale requested.

Indians; these reservations to be regarded as military reservations. The Indians to be invited to assemble within these reserves.

A system of discipline and instruction to be adopted by the agent who is to live at the post.

Each reservation to contain a military establishment.

The expenses of the troops to be borne by the surplus of Indian labor.

The reservations to be made with a view to a change in location, where increase of white population may make it necessary.[42]

A little later Beale set forth the plan in greater detail. In this elaboration he made it clear that he proposed to care for the Indians somewhat after the manner of the missions, without the religious emphasis of those institutions, and that he expected success to attend his plan because a similar method had been successful in the Spanish days. He estimated the number of Indians in California at from 75,000 to 100,000, and thought an appropriation of $500,000 should be made to begin the new system. General Hitchcock expressed himself officially as heartily in favor of the plan and asserted that the choice of the government lay between accepting Beale's plan or giving the Indians over to rapid extermination or expulsion from the state.[43]

Soon after sending his proposal to the Indian department Beale set out on a trip south. He began preparations for putting his plan into operation, in case approval were given it by the Indian office, by selecting as a location for some of the Indians a tract of land between the San Joaquin and Fresno rivers. No treaty was made with the Indians who were asked to go upon it, nor was a reservation set apart in the usual sense. It was his purpose to ask that the land be set aside as a government reservation to be held by the Indians by a simple agreement, so that the Indians might be removed at the government's pleasure.[44]

While the government at Washington was groping blindly

[42] Beale to Lea, September 16, October 29, 1852, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 36, 374.

[43] Beale to Lea, November 22, 1852, *ibid.*, 378-380; General Hitchcock to Colonel Cooper, November 29, 1852, *ibid.*, 32 congress, 2 session, no. 57, pp. 16-18.

[44] Beale to Lea, December 14, 1852, *ibid.*, 33 congress, special session, no. 4, pp. 390-392.

for some wise Indian policy for California, Beale's earlier suggestions were received. In response to an order of December 3, Beale went to Washington, where he reported the distressing conditions of the natives of California and the need for prompt action in their behalf on the part of congress. He presented with vigor his plan for small reservations where the Indians could be protected and taught to work. He proposed that the Indians should be persuaded to go on the reservations by simple agreement between them and the government, but that no treaties should be made.[45] The result was that congress gave authorization for the creation of five military reservations in California not to exceed 25,000 acres each, and appropriated $250,000 to defray the expenses of maintaining the Indians in California and removing them to the reservations. On April 13 Beale was ordered to return to California by the most expeditious route, in order to put the new plan into operation.[46]

Immediately after his arrival in Los Angeles on August 22, Beale began the execution of his plan by going to Tejon Pass, where a conference was held with some Indians and the purposes of the government concerning them were explained. He also conferred with some army officers, who had traveled much in the state, as to the best place for a reservation. The result of their discussion was a decision by Beale to locate a reservation in the Tejon region.[47]

As Beale passed on down the valley, still working on the plan for his first reservation, he visited the experimental farm which he had located the previous year on the San Joaquin river. He expressed himself as satisfied with the results. He found that the wild Indians that had been placed upon it had been able

[45] Lea to Beale, December 3, 1852, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, special session, no. 4, p. 33. On his arrival in Washington Beale showed by abundant evidence the sad condition of the California Indians. He presented the fact of their unfair and cruel treatment by the whites, who in numerous instances perpetrated atrocities upon them, and exploited and enslaved them. *Ibid.,* 32 congress, 2 session, no. 57, pp. 8-16.

[46] *Congressional globe,* 32 congress, 2 session, pp. 1085-1086; *United States statutes,* 32 congress, 2 session, p. 38; R. McClelland to Beale, April 13, 1853, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 1, pp. 464-466.

[47] Gwin H. Heap, *Central route to the Pacific from the valley of the Mississippi to California* (Philadelphia, 1854), 10-11, 110-118; *Daily Alta California,* September 22, 1853; Beale to Manypenny, September 30, 1853, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 1, pp. 469-470; *ibid.,* 478-479.

to support themselves. He believed that their success would be a means of inducing other Indians to settle on a reservation. The reservation Indians had learned to plow, to reap, to build corrals, and to tend gardens, and Beale was enthusiastic.[48]

A problem now presented itself in connection with the establishment of a reservation at Tejon because part of the land desired was covered by a Spanish land grant, and the law under which Beale was working gave no authority for the purchase of lands for Indian purposes. Beale asked the opinion of the California congressional delegation as to the wisdom of proceeding. Being advised that he should make such conditional arrangements, subject to the approval of congress, as he considered indispensable to the successful operation of the law, he went ahead with his plan, even though the commissioner of Indian affairs advised postponement of the enterprise until there should be further legislation on the part of congress.[49]

The Tejon reservation started out well. By February, 1854, the Indians gathered there had under cultivation some 2,500 acres of land. Later in the year a company of men who paid a visit to the reservation reported 3,265 acres of land under cultivation, and more than 400 Indians working in the fields. The visitors wrote of what they had seen as a remarkable achievement. Their statements were concurred in by the editor of the *Pacific*, and were corroborated by the testimony of Captain P. E. Connor, who said that he saw on the reservation a great grain crop valued at a large sum, and Indians working at their various occupations with utmost cheerfulness.[50]

[48] Beale to Manypenny, September 30, 1853, H. B. Edwards to Beale, September 20, 1853, *ibid.*, pp. 471-474. Beale's enthusiasm over accomplishments and prospects was shared by others. The editor of the *Daily Alta California*, September 22, 1853, commended the plan of putting the Indians on reservations where they could learn to support themselves. Then he said: "Five years after the first settlement is made and put into successful operation the Indian affairs of California will cease to be an item of expense to the General or State Government; all hostilities will be over; the whites will be entirely free from annoyance by the Indians; the Indians will be transformed from a state of semi-barbarism, indolence, mental imbecility, and moral debasement, to a condition of civilization, Christianity, industry, virtue, frugality, social and domestic happiness and public usefulness."

[49] Beale to W. M. Gwin and M. S. Latham, September 27, 1853, to Lea, September 30, 1853, Manypenny to Beale, November 18, 1853, in *Senate executive documents*, 33 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 1, pp. 470-471, 474-476, 480-481.

[50] Beale to Manypenny, February 8, 1854, in *Report to the commissioner of Indian*

But further progress of the reservation system under Beale was rudely checked by reason of political developments and his own neglect properly to attend to certain business matters. During the early part of 1854 political opposition to Beale began to manifest itself, and some of his friends feared that congress would refuse to appropriate the money needed for further expansion of the system.[51] Unfortunately Beale had neglected to use care and promptness in dealing with the department to such an extent that a large part of the appropriation of $250,000 remained unaccounted for in the spring of 1854. This neglect proved disastrous to him when the question of providing for the future of Indian administration in California came before congress.

It was on May 1, 1854, while the question of the amount to be appropriated for Indian affairs in California was under consideration in congress, that Beale's accounts were reported in arrears to the extent of nearly $250,000. The result was that when the measure providing for funds for Indian service in California was passed, the appropriation for the development of the reservation system was cut down to $125,000 and the number of reservations which might be created was reduced from five to three. Until just before the final passage of the bill, a provision was attached estopping Beale from drawing any portion of the amount appropriated until he had accounted for the former appropriation, but this was withdrawn before the final action on the measure, because Beale was removed from office while congress was taking action and another person was appointed in his place.[52]

Beale's successor was Thomas J. Henley, an able man and a

affairs, 1854, pp. 298-299; *Los Angeles Star,* June 17, 24, 1854; *Stockton Republican,* in Hayes collection, Indians, vol. 2, nos. 124, 129, 144; *Pacific,* June 30, 1854.

[51] *Los Angeles Star,* June 17, 24, 1854, in Hayes collection, Indians, vol. 2, nos. 124, 129; T. H. Benton to Beale, April 3, 1854, in Stephen Bonsal, *Edward Fitzgerald Beale* (New York and London, 1912), 186-187.

[52] *Congressional globe,* 33 congress, 1 session, part 2, pp. 1027, 1028, 1041-1051, part 3, pp. 1895, 1945, 1983; *United States statutes,* 33 congress, 1 session, p. 332. It should be said that a thorough investigation of Beale's accounts was made. A report on the subject by the comptroller to the secretary of the treasury, April 9, 1885, completely vindicated Beale and partially restored him to public confidence. See J. M. Broadhead to James Guthrie, April 9, 1855, in *Senate executive documents,* 34 congress, 3 session, no. 69, pp. 1-7; Hayes collection, Indians, vol. 2, no. 153.

successful politician. He received his instructions under date of June 2, 1854, and entered upon his official duties on July 15. He went first to Tejon, where he took possession and began supervision of the public property located there. While it seemed to him that Beale had somewhat overstated the degree of prosperity at Tejon, things were in most respects as represented. Henley was convinced by what he saw that the military reservation system furnished the only wise method of dealing with the Indians, and he planned to develop the establishment at Tejon along the lines on which it had been begun. He spent more than a month at this place getting things in order for development under his assistants who were left in charge.

From Tejon Henley went north over the emigrant road, examining the country and studying the Indians as he proceeded. From the San Joaquin valley he continued farther north, intending to spend the remainder of the year among the hundreds of small tribes of Indians in that section. Before the end of September he had established Nome Lacke reservation in Colusa county, which was to become one of the most permanent and useful of all the reservations. A site for a military post was selected on the reserve, a subagent was put in charge, and the natives began to assemble at once and to prepare winter quarters.[53]

The reports of Henley to the department, full of details of the work at Tejon and Nome Lacke, were optimistic concerning the progress and promise of the reservation system. Indeed, it was made to appear that the organization and development were so satisfactory at Tejon that there would be little necessity for expenditures there after the year 1854-1855. While impressing the department with the progress of affairs, Henley recommended the modification of the law under which he was working so as to permit the making of five reservations instead of three, and asked for an appropriation of $200,000 for the two additional establishments. His request was granted. The law was modified in accordance with his wishes as to the num-

[53] T. J. Henley to Manypenny, August 28, 1854, in *Report of the commissioner of Indian affairs,* 1854, pp. 300-307; *Senate executive documents,* 34 congress, 3 session, no. 69, p. 1; *Weekly Placer Times and Transcript,* September 30, 1854; E. D. Keyes to E. D. Townsend, December 12, 1854, in *House executive documents,* 34 congress, 3 session, no. 76, pp. 88-89.

ber of reservations, and an appropriation of $150,000 was made for removing and supporting the Indians on the two additional reservations. With this added appropriation, the total sum provided for Indian affairs in California for the year 1855-1856 was $360,300.[54]

Up to September, 1856, there had been established four permanent reservations. These were Tejon, Nome Lacke, Klamath on the Klamath river, and the Mendocino on the shores of the Pacific. In addition, temporary reserves or farms had been established on the Fresno and King's rivers, and at Nome Cult valley in the coast range of mountains. Henley's report indicated a flourishing state of affairs at practically all locations; but, unfortunately for his credibility, his glowing accounts of progress were contradicted by the reports of army officers to whom General Mackall addressed an inquiry in August, 1856. These reports indicate that Henley grossly exaggerated the prosperity and development of the reserves, and that they were improperly managed.[55]

Although differences of opinion had developed in California with reference to the success of the Indian administration, the federal government continued for two years more to make large appropriations for the maintenance and development of the system of military reservations, relying upon the accuracy of the reports of Henley and his agents. But in 1858, just at the time when Henley was gathering from his agents their statements of progress,[56] Godard Bailey was given instructions as a special agent to visit the reservations. He was instructed to acquaint himself with their history and actual conditions, in order that he might furnish the Indian office with the data

[54] Manypenny to R. McClelland, November 25, 1854, in *Report of the commissioner of Indian affairs,* 1854, pp. 15-16; Henley to Manypenny, December 18, 1854, in *Senate executive documents,* 33 congress, 2 session, no. 42, pp. 3-4; *United States statutes,* 33 congress, 2 session, pp. 698-699.

[55] Henley to Manypenny, September 4, 1856, in *Report of the commissioner of Indian affairs,* 1856, pp. 236-239, 245; J. Edwards to W. W. Mackall, August 24, 1856, B. L. Beall to W. W. Mackall, September 29, 1856, L. Loeser to W. W. Mackall, October 28, 1856, John E. Wool to L. Thomas, November 3, 1856, in *House executive documents,* 34 congress, 3 session, no. 76, pp. 138-141.

[56] *Congressional globe,* 34 congress, 3 session, pp. 529, 532, appendix, p. 408, 35 congress, 1 session, appendix p. 572; *United States statutes,* 34 congress, 3 session, p. 183, 35 congress, 1 session, p. 330.

upon which to base an intelligent opinion upon the practical working system, and upon its value as applied to the Indians of the state.

Bailey visited several of the reserves, and in his report he discussed in some detail the conditions in each one. His communication, which in no sense took the form of an attack upon Henley or his agents, stated that the plan devised by Beale for collecting the Indians on farms and thereon supporting them by their own labor had proved a lamentable failure. He said:

> At present the reservations are simply government alms-houses, where an inconsiderable number of Indians are insufficiently fed and scantily clothed, at an expense wholly disproportionate to the benefits conferred. There is nothing in the system, as now practiced, looking to the permanent improvement of the Indian, or tending in any way to his moral, intellectual, or social elevation, the only attempts at anything of the sort that fell under my observation seeming to be rather the result of individual effort than to spring from the system itself.[57]

When the California Indian question came before congress in 1859, no move was made to abolish the reservations, but the appropriation for the removal and subsistence of Indians was cut down to $50,000 and that for incidental expenses of the superintendency, to $7,500. With the reduced appropriation James Y. McDuffie, the successor of Henley as superintendent, undertook to continue the system of Beale. His reports indicated that all the reservations with the exception of Klamath were in a dilapidated condition. Under these conditions, the commissioner of Indian affairs recommended the repeal of all laws authorizing the appointment of a superintendent and agents in California, the abandonment of the system in use, and the substitution of some other plan.

The scheme proposed by him was the division of the state into two districts, with a superintending agent in each, a supervisor to lead and direct the Indians in their labors, and only such mechanics and laborers as might be necessary to keep tools in repair. The Indians in the southern part of the state who worked on lands should have these furnished them. Reserva-

[57] G. Bailey to C. E. Mix, November 4, 1858, in *Report of the commissioner of Indian affairs,* pp. 298-305.

tions might be provided for the dispossessed Indians of the valleys, but the Indians who should settle on them were to be taught that they were not to be fed and clothed at government expense.[58] Based on these suggestions, after much discussion, a bill providing a new method of administering Indian affairs in California became a law on June 19, 1860.[59]

Under this law the secretary of the interior divided the state into a northern and a southern district. The northern district included all that part of California north of the southern boundary of the counties of Marin, Sonoma, Solano, Sacramento, and El Dorado, to the eastern boundary of the state; the southern district included all the rest of the state. Two superintending agents were appointed, and a modified, less expensive, but no more effective system of administration for dealing with the natives was instituted.[60] It consisted of placing the Indians on small reservations to which they were to go by simple agreement and not by treaty. This policy of small reservations, begun in California in 1853, was rapidly extended over the west. California thus made a distinct contribution to our Indian policy.

William H. Ellison
Oregon Agricultural College
Corvallis

[58] *Congressional globe,* 35 congress, 2 session, part 1, pp. 694, 734-735; *United State statutes,* 35 congress, 2 session, p. 400; A. B. Greenwood to J. Thomson, November 26, 1859, in *Report of the commissioner on Indian affairs,* 1859, pp. 23-24.

[59] *Congressional globe,* 36 congress, 1 session, part 3, pp. 2368-2369, part 4, p. 2904; *United States statutes,* 36 congress, 1 session, p. 57.

[60] A. B. Greenwood to J. Thompson, November 30, 1860, in *Report of the commissioner of Indian affairs,* 1860, pp. 20-21.

Between 1850 and 1859 the United States expended a total of $1,737,493 on Indian affairs in California. In addition to this amount spent in Indian administration, $924,259.65 had been appropriated to reimburse California for expenses incurred in Indian wars. There was yet some $600,000 in bonds of the state outstanding for which the state expected to be recompensed. These figures do not include the expenses incurred by the United States army in policing the Indian country and in suppressing Indian uprisings.

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Typical "America Letter"

In Norway letters from emigrants to the United States — popularly known as "America letters" — constituted, before 1838, the only written accounts of American conditions which were available for those peasants and artisans whose economically restricted situation rendered particularly interesting to them any authentic information as to resources and opportunities in the new world. These letters, describing personal experiences and offering observations on actual conditions in the new environment, were sent to friends and relatives, then copied, and recopied, and passed from one family to another, thus gaining a very considerable circulation. After 1838 a small number of guidebooks and books of travel appeared and were widely distributed. Later the northwestern states, little influenced by the wave of nativism that swept the east in the fifties, flooded the northern European countries with pamphlets picturing America as a veritable El Dorado and offering unusual inducements to venturesome men and women.[1] Returned immigrants, emigration agents, representatives of states, railways, land companies, and steamship lines arrived in the Scandinavian kingdoms to enforce by personal influence the effect of the written and printed word. But long after 1838 the private letters went to large numbers of places where the "America book,"[2] and other pamphlets of a similar nature were unknown, and to which few travelers ever came. The "America letters" were circulated not only through oft-repeated copying, but also by being printed in newspapers. In fact, a common substitute for the mails was the use of newspapers as a channel

[1] A study of this official state activity, with special reference to Wisconsin, may be found in Theodore C. Blegen, "The competition of the northwestern states for immigrants," in the *Wisconsin magazine of history*, 3: 3-29.

[2] Rynning's *True account of America* was everywhere known, among the Norwegian peasants, as the "America book."

of personal communication. In Norwegian newspapers published in America, letters were not infrequently printed in full, and reached their private destination through the circulation of the newspapers.[3] In Norway also, the newspapers aided materially in the dissemination of information about life in the American settlements.[4]

The significance of the earlier letters lies in their informative character. But as time went on and the immigrants in America, who were rapidly pushing their way into the northwest, began to grow prosperous, their letters would often contain money or prepaid tickets. It is estimated that approximately one-half of the immigrants to America from Norway in the later period made the journey on prepaid tickets purchased in America.[5]

Of all the Norwegian writers of "America letters," the most influential and widely famed was an emigrant of the year 1831 who settled in the small colony in western New York which had been founded in 1825 by the first group of Norwegian immigrants to America in the nineteenth century.[6] This man, Gjert Gregoriussen Hovland, was no scholarly critic; he wrote for the benefit of peasants, and he was himself a farmer of moderate attainments. Perhaps he painted his picture in colors somewhat too bright; possibly he did not sufficiently stress the difficulties to be encountered. But on the whole his picture of America was not untrue. He possessed sufficient discernment to see that the United States offered many opportunities that were denied the farmer in Norway. Inexpensive land in a country

[3] For a good illustration, see Albert O. Barton, "The beginnings of the Norwegian press in America," in Wisconsin historical society, *Proceedings*, 1916 (Madison, 1917), 203-204.

[4] Some early instances are *Bergens Stiftstidende*, June 11, 1841 (printing a group of "America letters" written by emigrants of 1839); *Fyens Stiftsavis*, 1847, nos. 266, 267 (containing an "account of the conditions among the Norwegian settlers in Wisconsin," written by the pioneer minister, C. L. Clausen); *Christeligt Folkeblad*, vol. 1 (1846), no. 36 (containing another letter written by C. L. Clausen). A monthly newspaper called *Norway and America* was published in Norway in the years 1845-1847.

[5] See Theodore C. Blegen, "The America letters," in the *North star*, 2:43.

[6] The most detailed account of this New York settlement of Norwegians is in Rasmus B. Anderson, *The first chapter of Norwegian immigration (1821-1840) its causes and results. With an introduction on the services rendered by the Scandinavians to the world and to America* (second edition — Madison, Wisconsin, 1904), 54-131.

of freedom and democratic institutions gave promise of happiness and prosperity. Those who came in response to his invitation found after a few years of effort the contentment of which there is promise in Hovland's lines.

The letters of Hovland were spread about in southern Norway by the hundreds of copies, everywhere arousing interest in America and replacing with definite and concise information the vague rumors and guesses that filled so many minds with uncertainty about the land to the west. The emigration from Norway in 1836 and 1837 was directly and very considerably influenced by Hovland's letters; and, directly or indirectly, the movement after 1837 bore witness to their effectiveness.[7] Evidence indicates that, though the letters had greatest influence in southwestern Norway, they found their way into many other parts of the kingdom.[8]

The comparatively large emigration from Norway in 1836 and 1837 awakened the apprehension of state officials, and a thorough investigation was ordered in the Hardanger district. The dean of this district, the Reverend Nils Herzberg, assembled all information available, and submitted a report to the *amtmand.* Accompanying this report were copies of several typical "America letters," including one written by Hovland from *Raakeister* (Rochester, New York) on April 22, 1835.[9] Recently a copy of Dean Herzberg's report was made from the original in the local archives at Ullensvang, Norway. The following translation of Hovland's letter was made from this transcription, which is now in the manuscript collection of the Minnesota historical society.[10]

THEODORE C. BLEGEN

[7] For estimates on the influence of Hovland's letters see Theodore C. Blegen, "Ole Rynning's true account of America," in *Minnesota history bulletin,* 2:242; Knud Langeland, *Normændene i Amerika, Nogle optegnelser om de Norskes udvandring til Amerika* (Chicago, 1889), 16 and n.; Svein Nilsson, "De skandinaviske setlementer i Amerika," in *Billed-magazin,* 1:74; Kendric C. Babcock, *The Scandinavian element in the United States* (*University of Illinois studies in the social sciences,* vol. 3, no. 3 — Urbana, 1914), 30, 35.

[8] Anderson, *First chapter of Norwegian immigration,* 331.

[9] Herzberg testifies to the importance of Hovland's letters.

[10] O. Olafson, "To Amerikabreve fra 1835," in *Normands-forbundet,* 4: 265-271; Blegen, "The America letters," in the *North star,* 2:44, and "Cleng Peerson and Norwegian immigration," in the MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW, 7: 316 and n. 54.

To Torjuls Asbjeldsen Mæland, Ullensvang Sogn, Kingservigs, Præstegjæld, Norway:

I must take this opportunity to let you know that we are in the best of health, and that we — both my wife and I — find ourselves exceedingly well satisfied. Our son attends the English school, and talks English as well as the native-born. Nothing has made me more happy and contented than the fact that we left Norway and journeyed to this country. We have gained more since our arrival here than I did during all the time that I lived in Norway, and I have every prospect of earning a livelihood here for myself and my family—even if my family were larger — so long as God gives me good health.

Such excellent plans have been developed here that, even though one be infirm, no one need suffer want. Competent men are elected whose duty it is to see that no needy persons, either in the cities or in the country, shall have to beg for their living. If a man dies and is survived by a widow and children who are unable to support themselves —as is often the case — they have the privilege of petitioning these officials. To each one will then be given every year as much as is needed of clothes and food, and no discrimination will be shown between the native-born and those from foreign countries. These things I have learned through daily observation, and I do not believe there can be better laws and arrangements for the benefit and happiness of the common man in the whole world. I have talked with a sensible person who has traveled in many countries, who has lived here twenty-six years, and has full knowledge of the matter; both of him and of other reliable persons I have made inquiries, for I wish to let everyone learn the truth.

When assemblies are held to elect officials who are to serve the country, the vote of the common man carries just as much authority and influence as does that of the rich and powerful man. Neither in the matter of clothes nor in seats are distinctions to be observed, whether one be a farmer or a clerk. The freedom which the one enjoys is just as good as that of the other. So long as he comports himself honestly he will be subjected to no interference. Everybody has the liberty to travel about in the country, wherever he wishes, without any passports or papers. Everyone is permitted to engage in whatever business he finds most desirable, in trade or commerce, by land or by water. But if anyone is found guilty of crime, he will be prosecuted and severely punished for it.

No duties are levied upon goods which are produced in the country and brought to the city by water or by land. In case of death, no registration is required; the survivor, after paying the debts, is free to dispose of the property for himself and his family just as he desires. There

is no one here who snatches it away, like a beast of prey, wanting only to live by the sweat of others and to make himself the heir to the money of others. No, everyone must work for his living here, and it makes no difference whether he is of low or of high estate. It would heartily please me if I could learn that everyone of you who are in need and have little chance of gaining support for yourselves and your families would make up your mind to leave Norway and to come to America, for, even if many more were to come, there would still be room here for all. For all those who are willing to work there is no lack of employment and business here. It is possible for all to live in comfort and without suffering want. I do not believe that any of those who suffer under the oppression of others and who must rear their children under straightened circumstances could do better than to help the latter to come to America. But alas, many persons, even though they want to come, lack the necessary means, and many others are so stupid as to believe that it is best to live in the country where they have been brought up even if they have nothing but hard bread to satisfy their hunger. It is as if they should say that those who move to a better land, where there is plenty, commit a wrong. But I can find no place where our Creator has forbidden one to seek one's food in an honorable manner. I should like to talk to many persons in Norway for a little while, but we do not wish to live in Norway. We lived there altogether too long. Nor have I talked with any immigrant in this country who wished to return.

We left our home in Norway on June 24, 1831. Sailing from Gottenborg on July 30, we landed in America September 18, and by October 4 we had reached this place in the interior where we now live. The day after my arrival I began to work for an American. In December I went and bought myself fifty acres of land. I put up a house which we moved into in the month of March, 1832. I then set to work with the greatest will and pleasure, for the land was covered with trees. In the fall I planted about one barrel of wheat and in the spring of 1833 we planted about half a bushel of Indian corn and three bushels of potatoes (the latter in May). The next fall we harvested fifteen barrels of wheat, six barrels of Indian corn, and fourteen barrels of potatoes. Wheat, which is grown almost everywhere, is used for one's daily food. It costs from three to four dollars a barrel, corn costs from one and one-half to two dollars a barrel, and potatoes fifty cents a barrel. Oats are a dollar a barrel, being used not for human food, but for the cattle and horses. We purchased a cow in April of the first year that we were here for eighteen dollars, from which we milked six *kander* (Norwegian measure) a day and sometimes more. A pound of butter costs, in the

towns, from eight to twelve *skillings,* salt pork from four to eight *skillings* a pound, and meat four *skillings* a pound.

A hired man engaged for a whole year receives from eight to twelve dollars per month in addition to board, washing, and lodging. A servant girl receives one dollar a week, or fifty dollars a year, besides board, washing, and lodging, and is not required to do heavy or outside work, but only work within the house. A laborer engaged to work the soil receives from one-half to one dollar a day and free board.

I can also inform you that the land is measured off with a pole eight ells and six inches long, this being called a *rod.* An acre measures sixteen rods in length by ten in breadth. One hundred acres, here called a *lot,* makes a piece of land of considerable size. I am certain that from fifty acres here, we harvest many times more than from a *gaard* in Norway. I believe that an acre is something more than a *tönde sæd* in Norway; an acre is sown with two bushels of wheat.[11]

Six families of the Norwegians who had settled in this place sold their farms last summer and moved farther west in the country to a place which is called *Ellenaais.*[12] We and another Norwegian family have also sold our farms and intend to journey, this May, to that state, where land can be bought at a better price, and where it is easier for one to get started. The supply of trees there is only sufficient to meet one's actual needs. Cattle can be fed there at little cost, for one can cut as much hay there as one needs. There is an untold amount of land which the United States own and which is reserved by an established law at a set price for the one who first buys it from the government. It is called public land, and is sold for $1.25 per acre. Land thus bought and paid for is held in allodial possession for the purchaser and his heirs. Whether native-born or foreign, one is free to do with it whatever one pleases.

This is a very beautiful and fertile country. Prosperity and contentment are to be seen almost everywhere one goes. Practically everything that one needs can be sown or planted here; it grows splendidly and yields in many-fold measure, without the use of manure.

[11] A *gaard* is a Norwegian farm. A *tönde sæd,* or *tönde land,* is a Norwegian measure of land, 56,000 square feet. Perhaps Hovland means merely that an acre and a *tönde land* are not identical. Actually the latter is larger than the former.

[12] Hovland here refers to the migration, in 1834, of Norwegians from the New York settlement to the Fox river valley in Illinois. The leader of this movement was Cleng Peerson, who in 1833 had visited Illinois and selected the site for the settlement. The Fox river settlement was the first Norwegian settlement in the west, and it became a nucleus from which settlement radiated, in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa. See Blegen, "Cleng Peerson and Norwegian immigration," in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 7: 318-321.

Excellent order and good laws exist here, and the country is governed by wise authorities.

I sold my land last summer, in July, 1834, and by the transaction earned in cash the sum of five hundred dollars. I have now decided to buy one hundred and sixty acres, an amount which can be paid for with two hundred dollars. The eight Norwegian families still in this neighborhood desire to sell their land as soon as they can, and to move west, for they prefer to live near each other, although many of the natives are just as good people.[13]

In America one associates with good and kindly people. Everyone has the freedom to practice that teaching and religion which he himself favors. Nor are there any taxes to be paid here, except for the land one owns, and not even that tax is large. Nor are there other useless expenditures for the support of persons — as in many places in Europe— who are of no benefit, but much rather to the harm of the country. For the fifty acres which I have sold I paid annually one dollar in taxes. I must let you know that on the piece of land which we sold there were more trees than I could count of the kind that produces sugar, and these trees were common everywhere. We did not take more than we needed for our own use each year. Usually it is in March that one does this work, when the sap begins to spring up in the trees; with a small iron one chops a dent in the tree, placing under it a piece of hollowed-out wood as a trough. From out of the tree there come forth from two to three pails of sweet sap a day, and this sap produces sugar, syrup, ale and vinegar.

There is much more of which I could write to you, but I will close for this time, with hearty greetings from my wife and son and myself to you, my relatives and acquaintances. Let us be happy in heart and consecrated in spirit so that when the race has been run, when the pilgrim's staff has been laid down, we may be worthy of hearing the glorious words: "Blessed of my Father, come ye and inherit the kingdom and the righteousness prepared for you." Wherever we may wander in this earthly sphere, let us seek Him who is the true light and life, and follow His voice which calls to our hearts, no matter where we go or stand. Live well in the sight of God: that is my wish as your friend. Greetings to Knud Oppedal and Johannes Hovland and to all who inquire about me.[14]

April 22, 1835

GJERT GREGORIUSSEN HOVLAND

[13] Hovland himself went to Illinois in 1835 and lived in the Fox river valley settlement until his death in 1870.

[14] After noting the matters stressed in this typical "America letter" it is interesting to examine a report made in 1843-1844 by a Norwegian royal commission

The Mohegan Indians: A Communication

The June-September, 1921, number of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review in the account of the fourteenth annual meeting of the association contained the following reference to my paper upon the "Mohegan Indians east and west," read at that meeting: "Mr. George A. Wood of Ohio state university sketched the history of the Mohegan Indians (or, as the bureau of ethnology would have us say, the 'Mahican')."

My usage of the names applied in my paper to the various Indian nations and groups mentioned was based upon the *Handbook of American Indians, north of Mexico*, edited by Frederick W. Hodge, to which appropriate footnote references were made. This work was published as *Bulletin* number 30 of the bureau of American ethnology (Washington, 1907-1910). In this bulletin, part 1, page 786, appears recognition of the fact that although the related tribes with which my paper chiefly dealt were known under a large variety of dialectical forms, this name "in practical use has been limited to two bodies, one on the lower Connecticut r., Conn., known dialectically as Mohegan (q. v.), the other, on Hudson r., known as Mahican." Although my paper referred repeatedly to both Mahicans and Mohegans according to the usage just quoted, in view of the fact that the subject which I had chosen related primarily to the Connecticut branch of the nation I employed "Mohegan" as the more suitable designation of the tribe, especially as the branch alluded to by that name by Hodge is given precedence both by him and in popular usage. That branch also seems to have been more important historically than the other.

The bureau of American ethnology published in its seventh annual *Report* in 1891 J. W. Powell's "Indian linguistic families of America north of Mexico." The index of this work re-

charged with the duty of investigating the emigration movement and its causes up to that time. The commission made a careful study of the matter and gathered a large number of letters and diaries from immigrants. The report, "Angaaende udvandringer til fremmede verdensdele," is in *Kongeriget Norges ellevte ordentlige storthings forhandlinger i aaret 1845. Förste deel, indeholdende kongelige propositioner og meddelelser litr. A og B. samt no. 1-9* (Christiania, 1846), part 1, no. 6. For a brief discussion of the significance of the report see Blegen, "Cleng Peerson and Norwegian immigration," in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 7: 314-318.

fers to Mahicans but not to Mohegans; nevertheless, there appears on page 48 of the book a table of the principal Algonquian tribes (to which the index does not refer), in which appear as distinct tribes the Mahican and the Mohegan. Hodge in the preface to his work quoted above refers to the classification used in Powell's treatise as the result of a preliminary study of the subject and adds that "on it is based, with few exceptions, the present Handbook."

The introduction by Edward Everett Hale to James H. Trumbull's *Natick dictionary* (published as *Bulletin* number 25 of the bureau of American ethnology — Washington, 1903) also uses on page xii the name Mohegan in referring to the Connecticut tribe. Likewise, David I. Bushnell, Jr., in his *Native villages and village sites east of the Mississippi* (published as *Bulletin* number 69 of the bureau of American ethnology — Washington, 1919) on pages 10 and 11 follows when mentioning these tribes the usage of Powell and Hodge as quoted above in regard to names, and places them respectively in the habitats assigned to them by Hodge in the articles under those names in his *Handbook.*

The term "last of the Mohegans," which appears in quotation marks in the comment on my paper referred to above, was not employed in the paper, which manifestly was not an attempt to treat exhaustively all phases of Mohegan history, and especially not the contemporary aspects of it.

George A. Wood

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

Texas and the Mexican war. A chronicle of the winning of the southwest. By Nathaniel W. Stephenson. [The chronicles of America. Edited by Allen Johnson under the supervision of the committee on publications of the Yale university council] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1921. 273 p.)

This book is not in the immediate field of its author's specialty, but it meets what seem to be the essential requirements of its series with reasonable success. The style is sprightly, and it sketches the history of its assigned topics pleasantly. The most nearly satisfactory portion of the book is that presenting the European relations of the Texas question. The solid background for understanding this intricate subject is afforded by the author's knowledge of the political history of the United States and England in the early forties. The least satisfactory part of the performance is that describing the Mexican war. What caused the war? Any attempt to answer must give more than a brief, incidental paragraph to the thirteen years of intermittently active, and sometimes hectic, negotiations for the settlement of the pecuniary claims of American citizens against the Mexican government. The subtitle of the volume is much too large for the meager references to California and New Mexico.

There are some misstatements; some erroneous implications and assumptions; and certain questionable characterizations, arising (one suspects) from the desire to make a piquant story rather than from conviction. But the sponsors of this series loudly insist that its strongest claim to favor is its departure from the ways of the monograph. To catalogue what by a different standard would be imperfections might perhaps be unfair, and would certainly be tedious. The random illustrations which follow are intended therefore merely as an expansion of the first sentence of this paragraph. Why "misty imperialist" for Jackson (page 88)? And why "ostentatious" of Polk (page 168), who was the most deadly matter-of-fact unconscious egotist unredeemed by a spark of humor since John Adams? To declare that John Quincy Adams "once defeated annexation" (page 118) is to take at Adams' own valuation his remarkable speech of June 16–July 9, 1838; but there were many other, and more effective, factors than Adams' opposition in the post-

ponement of annexation. To represent the Texan Santa Fé expedition simply as an effort "to break up the trade . . . between Mexico and the United States through Santa Fé" (page 111) without explaining that the boundary which Texas claimed by statute included that depot is misleading. Under any aspect of the matter it is difficult to conceive how the expedition violated the neutral rights of the United States or the principles of international law. And the old San Antonio road — since St. Denis crossed the province from Natchitoches to Eagle Pass in 1714 the idea of a trail stretching across the vast wilderness has intrigued the imagination of writers. Thus (page 34), "Along this road in the hot summer [of 1830] Teran's army must have marched" to be distributed "in a dozen or more contonments" — though the several hundred soldiers who formed this army actually reached Texas by sea, and established six posts in addition to the three already in Texas. But these errors are not fatal. They are more or less inherent in the plan of the series, and to such as need the *Chronicles* this volume will certainly be useful.

EUGENE C. BARKER

The American spirit in education. A chronicle of great teachers. By Edwin E. Slosson. [The chronicles of America. Edited by Allen Johnson under the supervision of the committee on publications of the Yale university council.] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1921. 309 p. $5.00.)

It would not be fair to Mr. Slosson to evaluate this volume from the standpoint of a critical student of the history of education. In fact one would not be justified in reviewing it as one would review a textbook or a reference work to be used by classes in the history of education in our normal schools or colleges. It was not prepared with the expectation that it would be considered either as a contribution to the literature of the history of education or as a textbook. As one of the volumes of the *Chronicles of America* series, it well justifies its publication.

I take it that those who read this book are interested in a general way in all of the movements which have resulted in the development of our present-day American civilization and wish to secure some familiarity with a few of the more outstanding movements in education in this country. Mr. Slosson has succeeded in presenting an eminently readable book which occasionally includes some historical facts not ordinarily found in the ordinary history of education but which in the main merely presents the better-known educational landmarks. He has attempted in his organization of a number of chapters to have the historical facts center around outstanding figures, especially in the chapters showing the influence of Franklin, Jefferson, Washington, Horace Mann, and

Dewitt Clinton. While there is little continuity to the book, particularly in the latter chapters, the spirit in which he has presented the movements in education is liberal, with a decided willingness to emphasize the unfinished nature of many of our problems. The book would have been more satisfying to many of us if he had permitted himself to be more critical of modern movements. This is particularly true with reference to such subjects as the rise of technical education, the question of federal influence upon education, and the unsolved problems that have to do with higher education.

Inasmuch as relatively so small a part of the volume is really devoted to the influence of the individual in education, the subtitle — "A chronicle of great teachers" — is unnecessary, as is also the attempt already mentioned to associate great educational movements with individuals, after all not so notably identified with these movements as the titles of the chapters would seem to indicate.

The typographical appearance of the book is all that can be desired. It is eminently fitting that the *Chronicles of America* should include some such volume as this; and, as has been said, if the book is considered merely as one of a general series, the critical attitude that one might assume if this were heralded as a contribution to the history of education is unjustifiable.

C. E. Chadsey

The fathers of the constitution. A chronicle of the establishment of the union. By Max Farrand. [The chronicles of America. Edited by Allen Johnson under the supervision of the committee on publications of the Yale university council] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1921. xii, 246 p. $5.00)

The *Chronicles of America* series represents a most commendable advance in the publication of attractive, well-printed works of history, which combine — with the few inevitable exceptions — scholarliness, interest, and literary skill. Professor Farrand's volume is no exception in any of these respects, and particularly not as to scholarliness; for his long study of the period with resulting publications of well-known historical excellence fitted him admirably for this very brief sketch of the "critical period" of our nation's history. The historian may expect to find little that is new therein, either as to fact or interpretation; but he will appreciate the success with which the author relates in the brief compass of 30,000 words the bare plot of the story with sufficient light on the leading individual actors to make them more than names; and the general reader will glean from the well-told chronicle both information and interest often denied to him by longer works.

"There was nothing in the Revolution that transformed the essential

character or characteristics of the American people" (page 22). In this persistence of colonial-mindedness during the immediate post-revolutionary period lies the explanation of much of its history. War as usual brought a new political status, comparatively slight permanent economic change (witness the early resumption of close commercial relations with England, undesired and unanticipated, but necessary), and but little transformation of the hearts and dispositions of men. In the common difficulties and positive responsibilities imposed by the reconstruction after the war, rather than in the negative anti-English unity during the war, was to be found the more potent reagent for the decomposition of separateness and disjunctive colonial traditions.

In his enthusiasm for the vital American contributions in the articles of confederation and the constitution, the author does not neglect the importance of European origins therein. The prevalence of monarchical thought and rumor at the convention of 1787 may astonish many. Perhaps the sentence: "The members of the Convention evidently thought that they were establishing something like a monarchy" (page 134) might well be moderated a little in order to prevent misunderstanding by many readers. In Jefferson, we are shown the man who "expressed the genius of American institutions better than almost any other man of his generation, . . . displaying not so much originality as sympathetic appreciation of what had already been done, and an instinctive forecast of future development" (pages 64, 67). Hamilton was "perhaps the most brilliant of American statesmen with an extraordinary genius for administrative organization" (page 104).

The excellent photogravures, and particularly the ten plates of the forty signers of the constitution from the Thomas A. Emmett collection in the New York public library, enrich the volume greatly. The detailed description of the originals (pages 225-238), written by Victor Hugo Paltsits, renders the volume one of special interest to students of American portraiture.

There is, however, entirely too little of this volume. It treats the period which, almost of all periods, should and does interest Americans. Of the 246 pages, only 166 are devoted to the text. The inclusion in such a brief work of the important state documents of the period is of questionable wisdom, with the exception, perhaps, of the constitution itself. Not one out of a hundred readers will profit by their inclusion here, and the volume will find itself in few or no libraries which do not contain all the documents several times over. One cannot help but feel that more of the excellent chronicle which would be read, would be preferable to state documents which will not be read, and which are seldom far from one's hand when desired for reference.

Clyde Leclare Grose

Theodore Roosevelt and his times. A chronicle of the new nationalism. By Harold Howland. [The chronicles of America. Edited by Allen Johnson under the supervision of the committee on publications of the Yale university council.] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1921. 239 p.)

The career of Theodore Roosevelt was so many-sided and so full of human interest that although he has been dead only three years, probably more books have been written about him already than about any other American except George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. To this flood of biographies Harold Howland has added the volume under consideration.

As the book is in the *Chronicles of America* series, the author of necessity found himself restricted to writing a rather brief outline rather than an exhaustive work. Upon the whole, he has performed his task as well as the narrow limits assigned him would permit, and he has brought out the salient facts of Roosevelt's career in a readable way. For a considerable period the author and Colonel Roosevelt were associated together on the staff of the *Outlook*, and naturally Mr. Howland speaks with most authority concerning matters that fall within this period. Upon some of these matters he is able to cast interesting side lights. For example, he tells in considerable detail the story of the events that led up to Roosevelt's throwing his hat in the ring in the campaign of 1912. The joint appeal of the seven republican governors that he enter the contest was, it appears, arranged in advance for its political effect. The attitude of the author toward President Wilson and Secretary of War Baker is a hostile one, particularly in the matter of their refusal to accept Roosevelt's offer to lead volunteers to France. He quotes (page 271) a conversation overheard by him in 1912 in which Roosevelt admitted to Jack Greenway, a former Rough Rider, that he would be glad to die in battle fighting for his country. There are many Americans who think it a tragedy that he was deprived of that right. The book has a good index and a short bibliography, in which, strange to say, there is no mention of Bishop's book.

PAUL L. HAWORTH

My brother Theodore Roosevelt. By Corinne Roosevelt Robinson. (New York: Charles Scribner's sons, 1921. 365 p. $3.00)

The author has succeeded in demonstrating more clearly than any other of Mr. Roosevelt's many biographers, that his greatest contribution to his country and his time was personality, was Theodore Roosevelt himself. With a difference of only three years in their ages, their relationships were most intimate for over fifty years. Moreover, Mrs. Robinson served as counselor to her brother during the several stages of his career and the conversations and letters between them, freely quoted,

serve to clarify the point of view of Mr. Roosevelt on problems affecting his life. The spirit of helpfulness, love of family, of friends, and of country, activity of mind, and ability for hard labor manifested by Mr. Roosevelt are especially stressed. Particularly notable are the accounts of the development of the progressive party (pages 266-272) and of the relation of the United States towards the war and the league of nations (page 276 ff.).

The spirit which seems to have permeated his life and which was emphasized many times through addresses and letters was, as the author states, best summarized in the following letter from President Roosevelt, written in 1905 to the Provençal poet Frédéric Mistral (pages 234, 235). "You are teaching the lesson that none need more to learn than we of the West, we of the eager, restless, wealth-seeking nation; the lesson that after a certain not very high level of material well-being has been reached, then the things that really count in life are the things of the spirit. Factories and railways are good up to a certain point, but courage and endurance, love of wife and child, love of home and country, love of lover for sweetheart, love of beauty in man's work and in nature, love and emulation of daring and of lofty endeavour, the homely work-a-day virtues and the heroic virtues — these are better still, and if they are lacking, no piled-up riches, no roaring, clanging industrialism, no feverish and many-sided activity shall avail either the individual or the nation."

J. A. J.

The University of Michigan. By Wilfred Shaw. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920. 364 p. $4.00)

For eighteen years Mr. Shaw has served the University of Michigan and served it well. He knows its history, its traditions, and its student life. In spite of his attempts at modesty, he believes it to be the greatest of all state universities; in fact, he probably believes that, with perhaps the exception of Harvard, Michigan is the greatest of American universities. This is as it should be for a secretary of an alumni association, and no doubt many people would agree with him. Mr. Shaw says frankly, "It has not been the purpose of the author to write a history of the University of Michigan." What then was his purpose? Fortunately he has told us. "To chronicle in brief the main events in Michigan's history; to suggest their significance; to picture the life of the students and Faculties; and to set forth the University's real measure of success, in order that all who are interested in the University may know her and understand her ideals and traditions, is the aim of the following chapters."

In spite of the fact that the author lays no claim to being an historian,

he is essentially an historically minded man, but with one pronounced limitation. He loves the university too much to tell both sides of the story. From the day when the founders had the first great "vision" the university has grown under a nearly cloudless sky. Now and then a cloud in the shape of a foolish legislature, a turbulent student body, or a short-sighted board of regents, has appeared, but the clouds have never overcast the sky and have soon dissolved. The early members of the faculty were all good men and great men, and the presidents have never erred. Perhaps it is as well to let the skeletons alone. They are not especially genial companions, particularly for the alumni for whom the book was primarily written.

The chapters on "The foundation of the university," "The university's early days," "The first administrations," "President Angell and President Hitchins," "Literature, science, and the arts," "The professional schools and colleges," "Town and campus," and "The university in war time," are distinctly historical in character and have value not only as a history of the university, but as an important chapter in the history of the middle west. The rest of the book is rather material for history.

The space given to student activities and student life, and especially to athletics, in proportion to that devoted to "A state university as a center of learning" will probably please the "boys" who make the most racket at alumni gatherings, but the prosaic people who say little and think much will hope that there was more to tell about the "university as a center of learning." In this chapter Mr. Shaw seemed to be short of material. We trust that the shortcoming was that of the author rather than of the university. One wonders why the description of the board of regents was included in the "center of learning" chapter. Perhaps the explanation is found in the sentence, "The University has been truly fortunate for the most part in the men who have composed the governing body." The work of the graduate school might well have been elaborated in this chapter and the regents given a chapter all their own.

The book is well printed, and contains many pictures which will refresh the memories of the "old grads." The style is easy and direct, and at times approaches the colloquial; in this the author probably had in mind his audience, the average college graduate. As the university now has a live poet in captivity, something more will be required in a revised edition. The amiable stories disclosing the idiosyncracies of deceased professors will no doubt furnish many a speaker at alumni dinners with something to talk about, a godsend in these days of drought.

THOMAS MAITLAND MARSHALL

Recent history of the United States. By Frederic L. Paxson. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and company, 1921. 603 p. $3.75)

A subtitle to this volume, which covers the fifty-four years of our national history ending in 1921, might be "the period in which the new nation of the western hemisphere found itself and realized its powers." Like two of the author's former volumes, this book shows the contraction of the last American frontier and the expansion of the new nation. The work is adapted to college classes, but readers outside the academic world will find many chapters too profitable and interesting to leave unfinished.

Each of the fifty-seven chapters is from ten to thirteen pages in length — an arrangement which conduces to some interest and vividness but imposes the serious difficulty of reconciling the headings of chapters with their contents. In the chapter on "Protection," for instance, are treated pensions, the anti-trust law, the Sherman silver purchase act, the McKinley tariff, and Reed's principle of a quorum. The chapter on "Industrial unrest" is a conglomerate of discussions of the currency, the world's fair, the Pittsburg, the Homestead, and the Pullman strikes, naval architecture, and the strength of the federal army. Tariff history is widely scattered throughout the volume instead of being given a consecutive narrative. The delightful and fresh chapter on "Sports," on the other hand, gives an excellent continuous record.

There is an ample index, in contrast to the inadequate bibliographical notes appended to each chapter. The more serious student will wish for a fuller list of source materials. Citations to the famous Granger cases are lacking, for instance, and more citations to official documents should have been given and in some cases should have superseded citations to ephemeral political biographies. But four lines are given to the terms of the civil service act of 1883 although a two-page sketch of the reform movement precedes. The causes of the Roosevelt panic (page 334) are vaguely set down. Some readers will wish that some of the space given to military and naval strategy in the Spanish-American war had been devoted to an account of the acquisition of the Samoan or the Danish West Indian islands.

The reviewer feels evidences of hurried or loose diction not found in the author's former published monographs. The expressions "knowing the ropes" (page 374) and "Cleveland had glimpsed the theory" (page 405) are jarring. The meaning of an "unfilled vacancy" (page 265) is not clear. On each of two adjacent pages (488, 489) we are told that the selective service act became a law on May 18, 1917. Lemuel H. Weller's correct name was Luman H. Weller (page 167), and J. B. Weaver's middle name was Baird and not Bird (page 183). The re-

viewer believes that "the third cup of coffee" illustration (page 396) is to be credited more correctly to Lyman Abbott than to Mr. Roosevelt.

Despite these minor defects, however, the reviewer's interest and enjoyment have been greatly stimulated in reading the book. Although over half the chapters have a political flavor, the volume treats other great fields of thought and action such as education, inventions, labor ideals, and the growth of the far west. The chapters on America's part in the great war should kindle an honest glow of pride in the average reader as well as in hardened historical students. It would be no easy task to unfold, in an equal amount of space, a story of the last fifty years of our national life which should be more judicial, interesting, and compact than Professor Paxson's text.

LOUIS PELZER

Mexico and its reconstruction. By Chester Lloyd Jones. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1921. x, 330 p. $3.50)

The student of public affairs who has followed the passionate and prejudiced discussions of Mexican disorders during the last decade will welcome this work which comes from the saner and more conservative pen of a political scientist. The twenty-one chapters of the book deal with ten well-defined topics: population and racial elements; government, national and local; finance; the laborer; transportation; industries and internal commerce; foreign commerce; colonization and the land problem; foreign investments and the status of foreign residents; and, lastly, relations between the United States and Mexico.

The author's treatment of most of these topics is of necessity brief and somewhat cursory. An exhaustive study of any one of them would require a volume as large as that now under consideration. It is, however, the author's purpose "to help to indicate the various factors which must be taken into consideration . . . in arriving at a judgment of what may fairly be expected of a government working under such conditions as will confront Mexico during its trying period of reconstruction" (page ix). This he has succeeded in doing in admirable fashion. His poise, his fairness, his sound judgment, his grasp of the fundamentals of Mexican society, his familiarity with the sources are frequently in evidence.

When he comes to deal with the diplomatic relations of the United States and Mexico, the investments of American citizens and their alleged injuries, the disorders along the border, he seems, however, to assume an attitude decidedly Anglo-American. Emphasis upon the period subsequent to 1870 and almost exclusive reliance upon the published documents of the United States government result in a narrative too favorable to the republic north of the Rio Grande; enthusiasm

for the sacredness of contracts apparently precludes all suspicion that big business may have resorted to questionable methods to gain concessions in Mexico just as it has done elsewhere, and prevents recognition of the possible parallel between this phase of the Mexican problem and the difficulties which have confronted the United States in the last thirty years. In fact the author seems not to question the right of the United States to determine at what point the proposed Mexican taxes upon oil become confiscatory (pages 263-265).

Yet Mr. Jones makes it plain that he does not favor the annexation of Mexico. He is positive in his assertion that the United States does not "want" Mexico. He asserts that what the government and the people of the United States do want is order in Mexico, and he hints that in order to bring this about vigorous action on the part of the United States may be necessary. Would this mean intervention? The reader is left in doubt as to this point. If intervention should be resorted to it ought to be solely as a means to the end of helping Mexico to help herself. The author is convinced that an independent Mexico will prove far more satisfactory than permanent occupation for all parties concerned, and particularly for the United States. "A friendly, strong, and independent Mexico will bring greater economic advantages than the annexation that certain classes of Mexicans fear and some citizens of the United States desire," while there can be little doubt that a "friendly neighbor is a better bulwark than a disaffected province."

It may be noted, in conclusion, that the technical equipment of the book is good. The select bibliography will prove very helpful to students in this field; the footnotes, although not profuse, are fairly satisfactory; and there is included in the work a suggestive map of the industries and resources of Mexico.

J. Fred Rippy

Early records of Gilpin county, Colorado, 1859-1861. By Thomas Maitland Marshall. [The University of Colorado, historical collections, volume 2, mining series, volume 1] (Boulder, 1920. xvi, 313 p.)

The documents here printed include papers illustrating the early days (1859-1861) in seventeen mining districts lying within the present boundaries of Gilpin county. A rare map of the county, dated 1866, which has been copied for the frontispiece, indicates the relative positions of the several districts.

"The documents of each district are arranged in chronological order, and the districts follow the order of their organization." On this principle are placed first the papers relating to Gregory district, which was first in time and was also a kind of exemplar of methods of local government among mining camps. There is a table of the documents in the

Gilpin county court house, and a good index. This collection throws a flood of light upon the local government of mining camps, and changes in miners' law which are dictated by changing conditions, and the processes by which mining communities grow through expansion, and through the coalescence of several small units into a single larger unit. There is much sameness in the range of material illustrating the several communities; yet the diversity is sufficient to justify some repetition, for we here see the American political genius functioning creatively on the local plane.

Mr. Marshall's introduction, which presents the historical background of the Rocky mountain gold rush, is admirable, but brief. The reader ought to supplement it by reading also Marshall's "The miners' laws of Colorado" in the *American historical review*, 25: 426-439, where he discusses the bearings of the mass of documents he unearthed, of which this book contains only a part. One would welcome the above article as an introduction to the book. The volume is a distinct contribution to our knowledge of the self-governing mining type of community.

JOSEPH SCHAFER

History of Alabama and dictionary of Alabama biography. By Thomas McAdory Owen, LL. D. In four volumes. (Chicago: The S. J. Clark publishing company, 1921. Volumes 1 and 2, 1421 p., volumes 3 and 4, 1866 p. $28.00)

In 1906 the work on which Dr. Owen had been engaged for years and which was approaching a point where it would become the *History of Alabama* was wiped out by fire, and along with it disappeared books, letters, and other invaluable material which he had been gathering for a quarter of a century. Once more he set himself to the task, and at the time of his death in 1920 he had nearly ready for the press the manuscript which finally came out as the *History of Alabama and dictionary of Alabama biography.* The finishing touches upon the material, as well as the writing of some of the topics, were done under the supervision of Mrs. Owen with the assistance of the staff of the Alabama department of archives and history, a department of which Dr. Owen had been the founder and director. Thus, while the four volumes fittingly go out under the name of Dr. Owen, they do not appear as having received his ultimate and critical scrutiny.

The first two volumes of the work are general, the last two biographical. All four have their contents arranged in encyclopedic form. Strictly speaking, a title such as "The cyclopedia of Alabama history and biography" would much better indicate the scope and content of the work, since of purely narrative history of the state there is little. For

example, under the heading "Alabama, periods of history," the reader finds something less than four columns in which are outlined the eight periods from De Soto's visit to the present time. This, to be sure, is far from all the attention which historic events receive; one may turn to the topic "De Soto, route of," and find a careful analysis presented in two papers taken from the *American anthropologist.* Or, under "Reconstruction," he can find a summary of political and economic conditions during the dark days after 1865. Hence, if the reader searches diligently both in the general and biographical sections, he may uncover a vast fund of information about this commonwealth.

Each county, each city, each minor local unit is treated historically and statistically. Industries, organizations, institutions of all kinds; highways, rivers, railroads; fauna and flora; geology in the aggregate and item by item; laws upon various topics; all varieties of subjects come to the attention as the pages are turned. One may read of the institution of duelling, the laws which were passed to regulate it, and stories of famous duels which took place within the state in bygone days. One may trace the development of mining, or the steps which have been taken in horticulture, or find out when Abbeville was founded, how many people live there, and what industries center about the place.

Without a comprehensive index one is sometimes at loss to discover the location of some particular topic which happens to come to mind. A search, for instance, which tried the headings, "suffrage," "negro suffrage," "voting," "elections," "grandfather clause," and other catch words which seemed promising, failed to bring to the surface any account of Alabama's method of dealing with the subject of the elective franchise. No doubt the information is contained somewhere in these heavily laden pages, and "hope springs eternal." The encyclopedic method of handling almost any subject, with all its advantages, does fail at times.

The biographical volumes contain adequate sketches of hundreds of Alabamans, famous and obscure. A generous sprinkling of portraits adds to the value of the accounts, as do the frequent illustrations which are inserted in the first two volumes of the topics considered there. With many of the subjects are included selected bibliographies which guide the curious seeker to more extensive sources.

Altogether these volumes represent years of painstaking research which could come only in a labor of love. It is to be regretted that somewhere among these three thousand double-columned pages there could not have been found space for a history of Alabama in the usual conception of the term. But the future writer who does undertake this

task will find his toil materially lightened by the work which was carried so far by Dr. Owen, and brought to completion by Mrs. Owen and her colaborers.

L. B. SHIPPEE

The plains and the Rockies. A bibliography of original narratives of travel and adventure, 1800-1865. By Henry R. Wagner. (San Francisco: John Howell, 1921. 193 p.)

In 1920 this book first appeared but, because of a number of errors which crept in through "an unfortunate misunderstanding," the sale was stopped after some copies had been put into circulation. The author brought out another edition with corrections and additions the following year. The book, according to the statement of the preface, is "designed principally for the use of collectors." Nevertheless the student of western history, who, perforce, is most often not a collector in the accepted sense of the term, will welcome its appearance.

The material is arranged chronologically, starting with Alexander Mackenzie's *Voyages from Montreal* and concluding with Wright's *Chivington's massacre of the Cheyenne Indians*, printed at Denver in 1864 or 1865. Government publications and commercially issued works, as well as privately printed accounts, are noted in the list. Each item consists of the title of the work under consideration, together with a statement of such maps, charts, etc., as are to be found therein, and, in most instances, a note which gives an indication of its scope. Reprints and later editions are also noted with the details which would be desired by the collector.

Since this is a handbook for the collector and not for the historian, there are omissions which the latter regrets, for no matter what may have been the time when a narrative was written, the date of its publication determines whether it is to be included or excluded. For example, Lapenteur's *Forty years a fur trader on the upper Missouri* finds no place because it was printed some dozen years ago, although the tale has to do with the period comprised within the limits set by the compiler. Nevertheless, *The plains and the Rockies* should form a valuable addition to the bibliographical material available to the historian and will be an ever-present aid to those who devote attention to the ante-bellum story of the region west of the Mississippi.

The Wilderness road to Kentucky. Its location and features. By William Allen Pusey, A. M., M. D. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1921. 131 p.)

Dr. Pusey says in his preface, "I became interested in the location of the Wilderness Road through ownership of William Brown's journal of

the road. . . . To my surprise I found that in the accessible literature only the most meagre details concerning its location are available." Accordingly Dr. Pusey during the years 1919, 1920, and 1921 made trips over various portions of the route with the idea of locating exactly the nearly two hundred miles of trail from the block house in Virginia, some five miles from Kingsport, Kentucky, to its western terminus at Harrodsburg. As a guide in his work the author made use of all known accounts which threw any light upon the problem. The result is probably as accurate a description of the precise route as may be hoped to be obtained.

The text is interestingly written, and the reader is carried back to the days when this trail was the path over which thousands of people journeyed into central Kentucky. Profusely illustrated and equipped with maps which trace the road step by step, this little work brings the material together in a usable and attractive manner. The volume itself is an *édition de luxe* which it is a pleasure to handle.

The geography of the Ozark highland of Missouri. By Carl O. Sauer. [The Geographic society of Chicago, bulletin number 7] (Chicago: The University of Chicago press, 1920. 245 p. $3.00)

The Ozark highland, or the "Ozarks" as it is locally known, lies in five states: Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Illinois. The greater part of this region is in southern Missouri, and except for the southeastern lowlands and a triangular area in the Osage plain on the west, it covers all of Missouri south of the Missouri river. The entire region forms a rude parallelogram with its long axis running northeast and southwest. It is a few hundred miles southeast of the center of the United States, and together with the Ouachita mountains forms the only extensive tract of elevated land between the Appalachian and the Rocky mountains. Moreover, if the portion in Illinois is disregarded, it is somewhat insular in its position, being bordered roughly by navigable rivers, the Mississippi on the east, the Missouri on the north, the Arkansas on the south and the Neosho and the Osage on the west, and being girt likewise with the great lines of land travel, the most historic route to the far west running along its northern border, the route from St. Louis to New Orleans along its eastern border, and the one from Kansas City to the south along its western border. Structurally the Ozarks are a broad, asymmetrical dome, truncated by erosion. That part which lies in Missouri falls into seven geographical provinces, namely the Mississippi river border on the east, the Missouri river border on the north, the Springfield plain on the southwest, the central plateau in the center, and between the latter and the border regions the

St. François knob and basin, the Courtois hills, the Osage and the Gasconade river hills, and the White river hills.

The Ozark highland possesses much interest not only from the point of view of geology but also from that of geography and history. In the book under review the author confines himself largely to the geography and history of the region, devoting the first part to its environment or the various geographic conditions which have given it individuality and which have differentiated the various sections from one another, the second part to its settlement and development as influenced by these geographic conditions, and the third part to its recent economic conditions.

Historically the most important geographic divisions of the Ozarks have been the Mississippi river and the Missouri river borders. The first settlements in Missouri were made in the Mississippi river border in the early eighteenth century by the French, who came from Canada and New Orleans. In the latter part of that century the French extended their settlements into the lower Missouri river border. By that time the Americans had begun to make their way into these river border divisions, coming chiefly in the early days from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and the Carolinas. The chief attractions for the French and the first Americans were lead and furs. About 1830 the Germans began to come into these districts, and by 1850 they had largely displaced the earlier American settlements. To this day the counties of Missouri having the largest percentage of their population of foreign birth or parentage lie along the Mississippi and the Missouri rivers.

The Springfield plain and the St. François knob and basin rank next in historical significance. The chief industry that has made them so important is mining, more than half of the total mineral output of the entire highland region coming from the first of these two districts and most of the remainder from the other.

The central parts of the highland are rough and broken, especially the hill sections which surround the central plateau. Hence they are not so thickly populated nor so well developed economically as the other sections.

In his conclusions the author holds that while the Ozark highland on the whole is far inferior in wealth, population, and civilization to the plains of northern Missouri, it possesses resources which when fully developed will bring this region into much greater repute than it has at present. For example, it is well suited to dairying and stock raising and to horticulture and forestry. Its streams and springs offer opportunities for the development of water power on a large scale. Its

mineral deposits are by no means exhausted. It contains many idyllic spots well adapted for recreation purposes. If these natural facilities and opportunities are made the most of, the Ozarks will become a thickly populated region and a higher standard of life will be established there.

The sketch maps and the numerous illustrations from photographs add much to the book and make clear many of the facts brought out in the text.

The book will make its appeal to all students of the history of the Mississippi valley. It represents a new phase of historical geography, the story of a single geographical unit, and is worthy of emulation by other students of other sections of the country.

E. M. Violette

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

Number 8 of volume 7 of the Indiana historical society *Publications* contains a discussion of the "Science of Columbus," written by Elizabeth Miller (Mrs. Oren S. Hack).

The Department of historical research of the Carnegie institution of Washington has printed, as has been its custom for some years past, a *List of doctoral dissertations in history now in progress at the chief American universities* (December, 1921).

L. S. Rowe's "Development of democracy on the American continent" and William Henry George's "Montesquieu and de Tocqueville and corporative individualism" are two contributions to historical material in the *American political science review* for February, 1922.

In the *Journal of negro history* for January, 1922, are articles by Frances L. Hunter on "Slave society on the southern plantation," by Walter H. Brooks on "The evolution of the negro Baptist church," by Carter G. Woodson on "Early negro education in West Virginia," and by John W. Cromwell on the "First negro churches in the District of Columbia."

The Minnesota historical society has begun the publication of *Minnesota historical news,* a sheet which is distributed to newspapers for whatever use the editors may make of it. That issued for March, 1922, has "Naming a Minnesota county," "On the march in 1863," and "Notes of a birdman" as items for stimulating interest in Minnesota's history.

The address delivered by Henry Plauché Dart at the annual meeting of the Louisiana bar association at Shreveport on June 3, 1921, has been reprinted in pamphlet form from the official report of that association. The "Courts and law in colonial Louisiana" is the outcome of studies made by Mr. Dart among judicial records of the French superior council and the Spanish cabildo found at the Cabildo in New Orleans.

The *Palimpsest* for February, 1922, contains three articles, all having to do with military affairs touching Iowa in one way or another; these are "Moving the Winnebago," by Bruce E. Mahan, "With the First Iowa infantry," by Henry O'Connor, and "Paying the First Iowa," by

Hiram Price. The March issue has "Our first view of Vicksburg," by Clint Parkhurst, and "The lake of the Taensa," by John C. Parish.

The *Southwestern historical quarterly* for January, 1922, includes articles on "The last treaty of the republic of Texas" prepared by W. P. Webb, and the "Founding of Nuestra Señora del Refugio" by William E. Dunn. The "Journal of Lewis Birdsall Harris, 1836-1842" is concluded in this number, and the second installment of "The Bryan-Hayes correspondence" carries this interesting series of letters to January, 1857.

The *Year book of the Louisiana Sons of the American revolution* for 1921 contains, in addition to the customary account of the affairs of the society, historical material of importance. Theodore J. Dimitry presents some data respecting the assistance given the American revolutionists by the Spanish colonials in Louisiana; J. Hanno Deiler writes an "Extract from the settlement of the German coast of Louisiana and the creoles of German descent;" and two contributions give information about Spanish military personnel in Louisiana in 1779.

The Railway and locomotive historical society has printed as its second *Bulletin* (1921) a series of articles dealing with railroad history in the United States. Among the number are "The Fall river line boat train," by Warren Jacobs; "Eddy clocks" (which were not timepieces in the ordinary sense of the word, but the locomotives built by Wilson Eddy as foreman of the Western railroad shops at Springfield, Massachusetts), by John W. Merrill; "Some experimental and historical locomotives of the Chicago and northwestern railroad," by Roy W. Carlson; and "The rival builders" (the Taunton locomotive works and William Mason), by Charles E. Fisher.

The July, 1920, issue of the *Journal of the Illinois state historical society* contains "Sidelights on Illinois suffrage history," by Grace Wilbur Trout; "Lewis and Clark at the mouth of Wood river," by Charles Gilmer Gray; "Greene county: born one hundred years ago," by Charles Bradshaw; "Park college and its founder," by Pauline Aston Hawley; and "Recollections of Lincoln and Douglas in Hillsboro, Illinois," by John M. Whitehead. An account of the visit of Colonel Richard M. Johnson to Springfield is reprinted from the *State register* of May 26, 1843, and there is a discussion of the Illinois boundary as surveyed by Hiram Rowntree.

"The economist's spiral," the presidential address delivered at the Pittsburgh meeting of the American economic association by Jacob H. Hollander, is the leading article in the March number of the *American*

economic review. Then follows Edwin R. A. Seligman's paper on "The state of our national finances," read at the same meeting, and with it is printed the gist of the discussion which took place after its presentation. Other features of this issue are "Business teaching by the case system," by Wallace B. Bonham; the "Proposed program of social studies in secondary schools," prepared by the committee on the teaching of economics; and "The revenue act of 1921," by Roy G. Blakey.

Two formal contributions, in addition to historical news of interest to Iowans, appear in the January, 1922, number of the *Iowa journal of history and politics.* These are the third installment of Louis B. Schmidt's "The internal grain trade of the United States, 1860-1890," and a series of "Letters from the west in 1845." These letters were written by a young minister, Stephen H. Hayes, who "made a trip as far west as the Territory of Iowas, going by way of Boston, New York, Washington, Pittsburgh, and the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, and returning by the way of Chicago and the Great Lakes." Only the letters written after Hayes reached Pittsburgh are printed.

Dixon Ryan Fox, in the *Political science quarterly* for March, 1922, presents the second of his studies of "State history." In this contribution the theme is the centennial history of Illinois, and a notable tribute is paid to the staff of historians who produced that work. Other articles deal with "The league's disarmament activities — and the Washington conference," by Alden H. Abbott; "The political theory of syndicalism," by Rodney L. Mott; "A progressive tax on bare-land values," by John R. Commons; "Sources and methods in economic history," by W. L. Westerman; "A Monroe doctrine divided," by Charles E. Chapman; and "Are inventions inevitable?" by W. F. Ogburn and Dorothy Thomas.

In addition to the annual report and various information relating to the Michigan historical commission, the first number of the sixth volume of the *Michigan history magazine,* which bears the date 1922 with no month designated, contains a miscellaneous list of articles. Among these contributions are "The trial and execution of the Lincoln conspirators," by Judge R. A. Watts; "Some marriages in old Detroit," by William Renwick Riddell; "Women and history," by Mrs. Franc L. Adams; "Michigan as a field for the novelist," by Arnold Mulder; "Chief Okemos," by F. N. Turner; "William Austin Burt: inventor," by Horace Eldon Burt; and "The Chicago Indian treaty of 1821," by Sue I. Silliman.

The *William and Mary college quarterly historical magazine* for January, 1922, is largely given up to articles of genealogical interest, but Robert

M. Hughes's "William and Mary, the first American law school" is of more general interest. In this paper Mr. Hughes takes issue with the statement made by Hampton L. Carson, in the March (1921) number of the *American bar association journal,* that "In 1790 he [James Wilson] was chosen as Professor of Law in the University of Pennsylvania — the first publicly established law school in the United States." Mr. Hughes brings documentary evidence to demonstrate "that the first law school in America of any character, public or private, was established at the College of William & Mary in Virginia in 1779."

In the *Eau Claire Leader* (a weekly newspaper published in Eau Claire, Wisconsin) for January 29 and February 5, William W. Bartlett has brought out two articles on Cornell university lands in the Chippewa valley, telling the method by which Ezra Cornell succeeded in having New York realize more than a nominal sum for the scrip which went to that state as a result of the congressional act of 1862. The first article contains a sketch of Cornell, and tells how he laid the foundations of his fortune in connection with the establishment of the first electric telegraph between Baltimore and Washington. Mr. Bartlett has had the use of many documents, some of which are published wholly or in part in these articles, which throw light on certain phases of land deals, particularly timber land deals, of the sixties and thereafter.

Constitutions and constitution making figure largely in the *Missouri historical review* for January, 1922. The first two articles are "Constitutions and constitutional conventions in Missouri," by Isidor Loeb, and "The constitution of 1820," by F. W. Lehmann. William G. Bek contributes his seventh article on "The followers of Duden," this time treating of Gert Goebel, thus adding to the information, hitherto so little available, about the early German settlers of Missouri. Mr. Bek's studies have formed some of the most valuable of recent contributions to Mississippi valley history, and the *Missouri historical review* is to be congratulated for having printed them. Other articles in this number are "Missourians abroad — Florence D. White," by W. A. Kelsoe; "Traditions concerning the Missouri question," by Floyd C. Shoemaker; and "Pioneer life in southwest Missouri," by Wiley Britton.

The February, 1922, number of the *Historical outlook* contains "Higher education and training for citizenship," by George F. Zook; "The study of civics, report of a committee to the American political science association"; "The national council again," by Professor E. Dawson; "Projects in citizenship," by R. W. Hatch; and the first part of "Reference studies in oriental and early European history," by William R.

Lingo. The March issue has the conclusion of Mr. Lingo's syllabus, a report of the St. Louis meeting of the American historical association prepared by D. C. Knowlton, a "Syllabus in recent tendencies and problems in the study and interpretation of history," by H. E. Barnes, and a report of the conference upon adjustments between history and the other social sciences in the form of papers by R. M. Tryon and E. M. Violette together with a synopsis of the discussion which followed the reading of the papers at St. Louis.

To the March, 1922, number of the *Wisconsin magazine of history* General Charles King contributes the first portion of his "Memories of a busy life." Other papers are "The services and collections of Lyman Copeland Draper," by Louise Phelps Kellogg; "Wisconsin's saddest tragedy" (the killing of Charles C. P. Arndt in the council chamber of the territory of Wisconsin in 1842), by M. M. Quaife; and "Grand Butte des Morts, a hamlet with a history" — another of W. A. Titus' descriptions of historic spots in Wisconsin. Among the "Historical fragments" are found the "Visions of a Wisconsin gold seeker," which are embodied in a letter written in 1850 by A. B. Hunt, "More recollections of Abraham Lincoln," and "Vital statistics of the First Wisconsin cavalry in the civil war." The documents which are printed in this number consist of a series of wartime letters written in 1918 by E. J. Canright of the medical department of the 149th field artillery, A. E. F. The first of these letters were printed in the December, 1921, issue of the *Magazine*.

The Indiana historical commission has brought out as its fourteenth bulletin a little pamphlet entitled *Historical markers in Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1922). This "preliminary announcement" contains a statement of what has already been done in the way of marking historical spots in the various counties with a view of showing, so far as the commission was able to ascertain, what events have been commemorated and, by elimination, what still remains to be done. The legislature in the session of 1921 "specifically authorized the Indiana historical commission to coöperate with county historical societies and other organizations in promoting this movement;" and it is the desire of the commission to forward the work until Indiana will be able to emulate the New England states where "almost at every crossing, a bronze tablet, a boulder, or a monument" calls the traveller's attention "to the fact that on this site a battle was fought, a treaty was signed, an historical old building once stood, or some other event of special interest occurred there."

The *Illinois Catholic historical review* for January, 1922, has a wide range of articles. Three of interest on account of their timeliness are

"The papacy," by Anthony Czarnecki, wherein is given a description of the election of a new pope as well as a brief historical sketch of the papacy; "The new bishop of Chicago" (the Right Reverend Edward Francis Hoban, D. D.), by Joseph J. Thompson; and "Monsignor Daniel J. Riordan," by Mary Onahan Gallery. The Reverend John Rothensteiner's paper presented at the meeting of the Catholic historical association at St. Louis is printed under the title "Historical antecedents of the diocese of St. Louis." Joseph J. Thompson begins an account of "The Illinois part of the diocese of Vincennes." Other articles are a short account of the life of the Reverend William de la Porte, by Francis J. Epstein; "Notre Dame, antecedents and development," by Matthew J. Walsh; "St. Joseph's, the cathedral church of the diocese of Bardstown, Kentucky," by W. J. Howlett; "Illinois' first citizen, Pierre Gibault," by Joseph J. Thompson; and "Old mission, La Pointe du Saint Esprit," by Helen Cappen.

In the first number of volume 3 of the *Canadian historical review* (March, 1922) an "Examination of a deserter from Canada about 1708" is printed among the documents. Four contributed articles make up the greater portion of this issue: "Some Canadian constitutional problems," by Sir Clifford Sifton; "The last of the old tories," by J. L. Morison; "Immigration and settlement in Canada, 1812-1820," by A. R. M. Lower; and "The *Trent* affair of 1861," by F. Landon. In the last named article there is no attempt to adduce new facts, if, indeed, new facts are to be found, but the account is interesting because of the Canadian viewpoint, and because of the assertion that "the *Trent* affair, perhaps more than any other single incident during the Civil War period, was an influence in the development of the transportation systems of both Canada and the northern states. . . . The *Trent* incident and its attendant difficulties were presented to the British government as good reason for assisting with the building of the Intercolonial Railway." A government guarantee of the road was made, and since the military possibilities were uppermost in mind, "in a sense we owe the present inconvenient route of the government railway through the maritime provinces to the act of Captain Wilkes and its consequences."

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. IX, NO. 2 SEPTEMBER, 1922

THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Unlike so many meetings of the association, the fifteenth annual session at Iowa City on May 11 and 12, 1922, was spared the rainfall and storms not uncommon to meetings held earlier in the spring. Iowa City is in the central part of the great valley and with its thirteen thousand of population does not offer the distractions of the large cities. These factors contributed in bringing a goodly number of members to the meeting and in inducing a gratifying attendance at the sessions.

For the writer, a resident of Iowa City and a member of the local committee on arrangements, it may not be unbecoming to pass over the work of that committee as well as the hospitalities extended by the two state institutions at Iowa City. The program was carried out, with a few omissions, substantially as planned. One who has followed these meetings almost annually for fifteen years believes that this association has a definite field of work and that its work is being carried on better every year. The attendance at a meeting, it may be pointed out, is but a small fraction of the total number of interested members and industrious workers who are studying, writing, and interpreting history in the Mississippi valley.

Mr. Wilson P. Shortridge, of the University of Louisville, in the first paper of the session, "Kentucky neutrality in 1861," pointed out that the issue of neutrality hung by slender threads in the years 1860 and 1861. Adroit political management kept the state from seceding before March 4, 1861, and after that President Lincoln's great tact saved the state. Kentuckians were linked to both sections by social and economic ties which produced an attempt at neutrality not unlike that of the United

States in 1914 and 1917. The author expressed the belief that in declaring its neutrality the state of Kentucky hoped that it might act as mediator in bringing hostilities between the two sections to an end.

A somewhat new interpretation of the Kansas struggle was explained in "The pro-slavery background of the Kansas struggle," by Mr. James C. Malin of the University of Kansas. The motives and plans of the proslavery group were set forth. Senator Atchison and other proslavery leaders felt that a free Kansas would endanger slavery not only in Missouri but in the whole southwest. Their plan was to secure economic control and then political control. In the end both sides lost control of their programs in the Kansas civil war that ensued. "The pro-slave campaign hindered but did not prevent free settlement, and natural forces and the weight of members threw the scale in favor of a free Kansas."

"The rivalry of the French and English in the Ohio valley," by Mr. George A. Wood of Ohio state university, dealt with that great struggle during the period between the last two intercolonial wars. "The frontier from Niagara to the sea," said Mr. Wood, "was dotted with posts about which controversy raged, but which were, with the exception of Acadia, in the firm *de facto* control of one or the other power." Colonization enterprises, military expeditions, the erection of frontier posts, and frontier skirmishes carried the conflict more and more into the interior of the continent until the final outbreak of the decisive French and Indian war.

At the first luncheon session the association listened to an address by Mr. George F. Parker, the biographer of Grover Cleveland. In the brief time allotted, Mr. Parker's theme on "The American pioneer and his story" could not be given the concrete treatment it has received in other places. His plea was that the historian, the poet, and the romancer should invest the story of the pioneer with enduring interest. Mr. Parker's opinion that biography is the foundation of the pioneer epic "as in all history" may be challenged by the historians who are converted to the eternal facts of geography. "My own experience," he said, "early showed me that the most interesting facts, vital to reveal and interpret this life in one of these minor areas, could be found only in the minds of the settlers."

The afternoon of Thursday, May 11, was devoted to the discussion of problems of state historical societies. Mr. Clarence W. Alvord of the University of Minnesota opened this program with a discussion of "The coöperation of state historical societies with universities," in which he recalled his experiences at the University of Illinois.

Mr. Joseph Schafer, superintendent of the State historical society of Wisconsin, carried on the subject with a concrete account in which he related his experience in the two states of Oregon and Wisconsin. In the former the state historical society is located at Portland, sixty miles from the capital and twice that distance from the university. Its collections are hardly available to university students except during vacation periods. The library has grown mainly through unplanned accretions and Mr. Shafer expressed the fear that both the society and the university are "bound to fall further and further behind the best organized coöperative institutions." In contrast to this is the close connection between the university and the society at Madison, Wisconsin. The society builds up its collection under the watchful eye and the stimulating demands of the department of history of the university. The manuscript collections are widely used by advanced students and by professors from Madison and elsewhere. "The department of public documents and the department of newspapers are both popular work-shops for hundreds of history students, and the society provides expert caretakers, in effect reference librarians, to assist the users." Furthermore, the professors of history and of the other social sciences constitute part of the governing board and help to determine the policies of the society.

Miss Eunice G. Anderson, state historian of Wyoming, spoke on the topic, "The promotion of helpful relations between state historical societies and other organizations." In Wyoming the office of state historian was created in 1919 with an appropriation of five thousand dollars for two years. A general public interest in historical work was first created and publicity was conducted among editors and chambers of commerce. Museum material was exhibited at the state fair and the work of the society was placed before the Daughters of the American revolution, the State federation of women's clubs, and the American legion. Manuscript material has been collected; prize essay

contests in history have been conducted in the public high schools; and a bibliography of twenty-five suggested topics has been placed in the hands of students and research workers. "Courage, cheerfulness, enthusiasm, hard work, and more hard work" — these ideals explain the success of the work in Wyoming.

Mr. Doane Robinson in continuing this part of the program gave a recital of the work done and being done in South Dakota. There the society is in close relationship with the free library commission, which carries on the reference work of the historical organization. The study of South Dakota history in the public schools has been promoted by the society with wholesome effect on citizenship. Women's clubs have been aided in the preparation of programs in history and civics. Genealogical research by the Daughters of the American revolution is possible only in the library collections of the society. "We have promoted," concluded Mr. Robinson, "the organization of pioneer and 'old settler' associations in many counties and have encouraged the gathering of reminiscences of the members and the placing of the same in custody."

Originally announced as "John Brown," the subject of the presidential address by Mr. William E. Connelley was changed and dealt with "The religious conceptions of the modern Hurons." The history of these Indians was traced from the early years of the seventeenth century, when they were located on Georgian bay, to their removal in 1834 to Kansas and the dissolution of their tribal relations in 1855. The address described their religious conceptions, their mythology, their cosmic legends, and their superstitions, retained by them after more than two hundred years of contact with the white race. With remarkable tenacity the Indians have clung to their ancient customs and have preserved their pagan creed. "The value of the paper," said the speaker, "lies in preserving what remains of the ancient conceptions after so long a period in contact with Christianity."

Two papers read at the session of Friday forenoon will be enjoyed again when they shall appear in printed form. "Old Franklin: a frontier town of the twenties," by Mr. Jonas Viles of the University of Missouri, was a clear-cut picture of the economic and social life of old Franklin as gleaned from the files

of old local newspapers and from the records of the circuit and county courts. "Franklin, the metropolis of the Booneslick and the starting point of the Santa Fé trail, was through the twenties the westernmost town of importance in the United States; the product of special advantages, it was in many ways a transplanted growth rather than a typical frontier town, and was swept away by the Missouri before its inevitable decline to the commonplace."

A snapshot of another southern town was given in "A glimpse of New Orleans in 1836," by Mr. J. E. Winston of Sophie Newcomb college. In that year the city sent its exports of cotton, tobacco, and sugar to the Atlantic seaports, to Liverpool, Havre, and Trieste, and a thriving business was carried on with the ports of Mexico and with Cuba. Wholesale houses, theaters, banks, and hotels gave a cosmopolitan air to the city. Catholics predominated, but all the leading protestant denominations had secured a foothold. Education and philanthropic works existed, and the theater played a large part in the social life of the people. Licenses for theaters and gambling resorts constituted a lucrative source of revenue for the city. "In short, New Orleans exhibited at this period those striking contrasts of wealth and indigence, culture and ignorance, virtue and vice, that seem to have characterized the great urban centers of every country and clime."

Mr. Eugene M. Violette of the State teachers' college at Kirksville, Missouri, opened the program of the history teachers' section. In his paper on "The study of state history in the high schools of Missouri" he stated that only in recent years had the subject been deemed worthy of a place in the high schools. A set of questions was sent to 250 first-class high schools in Missouri, 190 of which replied. Of these, 108 were giving courses in the history of the state; 77 of these 108 schools reported that such courses were given in connection with civics or American history, but the remaining 31 stated that separate courses were being given in the subject. Although 82 schools reported that state history was not being taught, 34 of them stated that it will be offered next year. The tendency in Missouri seems to be to give the course in the first year, but the hope was expressed that the tendency will be rather to study the matter in connection with American history in one of the last two years. In that way the

teaching of Missouri history would be given a proper historical background.

A detailed and specific statement of how the social sciences can be made to correlate with the life of the community was presented by Miss Anna Krafka in her paper, "Possibilities of the social sciences in the public schools." Under her direction the eighth grade pupils in Ottumwa, Iowa, are assigned articles in the daily newspapers for study. There they learn about the primary election, the filing of nomination papers, political advertisements, and the names and duties of candidates. Immigration study is carried on by interviewing those who have come from foreign countries. In one case the pupils studied a speech of a federal judge which had just been given to a class of foreigners. "We should be constantly searching for material in the community that will make history and civics interesting to the children. They like to see ballots, search warrants, arrest blanks, pictures of historic places, naturalization papers, deeds, abstracts of title, and other things."

Mr. George M. Stephenson of the University of Minnesota read a paper on "Nativism in the forties and fifties with special reference to the Mississippi valley." Nativism has stalked about during every decade of American politics. The great increase in population in the west in 1850 and of the foreign born as shown in the census of that year gave alarm to the professional politicians and to the benevolent nativists. Men in all sections favored a probationary term of twenty-one years for citizenship, but the dominance of the slavery issue and the influence of the northern Mississippi valley acted as disintegrating forces. The know-nothing party tended to bind together the various racial stocks and to still antagonisms within the nationalities. The Mississippi valley, concluded the writer, was, during the last two decades before the civil war, the most American part of America. "It was receptive to ideas. It had a wholesome strain of radicalism; not everything new, whether imported or domestic, was profane. If America spells opportunity the Mississippi valley was thoroughly American."

In "Some unworked fields in the history of the Mississippi valley," Mr. Orin G. Libby presented an array of topics which are still lying fallow and awaiting the historian. With North Dakota as an example, Mr. Libby suggested many new lines of

treatment in mining history, in agricultural history, and in the history of stock raising.

Mr. Milo M. Quaife, of the Wisconsin historical society, in commenting on the formal papers of this session gave many topics for his state which were inviting to the historian. The study of racial groups such as the English and the Germans, for example, might lead to the revision of some generally accepted popular concepts.

Mr. Louis B. Schmidt of the Iowa state college at Ames, Iowa, made a cogent plea for the study of the economic history of agriculture. Agriculture has always been the leading occupation of our people, the subject is essential to a proper grasp of our political and constitutional history, it will aid in developing a sound and far-sighted rural economy, and, finally, it is necessary in completing a well-balanced history of the nation. A broad view of the subject would include a study of physiographic conditions, the westward migrations, and the relation of agriculture to other industries. Mr. Schmidt then outlined the following problems in the economic history of agriculture in the Mississippi valley: the public lands, leading agricultural industries, agriculture in the various states, transportation and marketing of agricultural products, farmers' organizations, agricultural education, and the biographies of leading men who have contributed to the development of agriculture.

The association during its sessions was signally honored by two guests — both products of the Mississippi valley. Mr. James Harvey Robinson, the author of textbooks and a teacher of nation-wide influence, was a source of inspiration to the many who have been stimulated by his writings. Mr. Hamlin Garland of New York City, speaking with Mr. Robinson at the dinner session on Friday evening, described the province of the novelist in reluming the past. Many who have experienced the scenes depicted in his *Son of the middle border* will agree that Mr. Garland has made solid contributions to the history of our great valley and can regard him as a fellow worker in its great untilled fields.

Louis Pelzer

State University of Iowa
Iowa City

RELIGIOUS CONCEPTIONS OF THE MODERN HURONS [1]

The Hurons are a very ancient branch of the Iroquoian linguistic family of North American Indians. They were found by the French in 1615 living about Lake Simcoe and the Georgian bay of Lake Huron. Why they were called "Hurons" is not entirely clear. One reason given is that the French who first saw them were impressed with their stiff, erect hair, which resembled that of the wild boars of Europe, and called them "Hures" or "Hurons," from *hure*, meaning "bristly," as applied to the rough hair of the head of man or beast. It has been suggested that it meant, as applied to these Indians, "a bristly savage."

The Jesuits were early among the Hurons and they set up a mission with stations in the principal villages of this barbarous people. The "Relations" of the Jesuit missionaries make up a collection embracing many volumes — one of the great authorities on the North American Indians. These priests relate that the Hurons were a confederation of four tribes: the Attignaouanton, or Bear people; the Attigneenongnahac, or Cord people; the Arendahronon, or Rock people; and the Tohontaenrat, or Deer people. There were a number of dependent villages or small tribes attached to the confederation. The name of the confederacy in the Huron tongue was "Wendoot," supposed to signify "islanders," or a people dwelling in the vicinity of bays and inlets of a large body of water. The Bear people and the Cord people claimed to have been the original settlers of the Huron stock in this prehistoric seat. They affirmed that they had dwelt there for at least two hundred years when the Rock people appeared in the country and were made a part of the confederacy. Twenty years later the Deer people applied for admission and were adopted into the confederacy. The Jesuits were told that the Rock people came into Huronia about the

[1] This paper was read as the presidential address at the fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at Iowa City, on May 11, 1922.

year 1590 and that the Deer people arrived some twenty years afterwards. It is believed that the Rock and Deer people came from the upper St. Lawrence valley, whence they were expelled or driven out, probably by other Iroquoian tribes. The latter-day Hurons have a tradition that they and the Seneca were formerly one people, and there are different accounts of the separation and its causes.

To the south of the Hurons dwelt their kindred, the Tionontati and the Neutral nation. East of these lived other related tribes which occupied most of the valley of the St. Lawrence and the present state of New York. Those on the south side of the St. Lawrence formed the Iroquoian league about 1570 and became known as the Five Nations, and, later, with the addition of the Tuscarora, the Six Nations. The people embraced in this league came to be known as the "Iroquois," an Algonquian term meaning "enemies" or "snakes," the word "snake" being very frequently used in describing enemies by Algonquians. The league was a superior political organization which entered actively upon the conquest of surrounding territory. It conquered many kindred tribes, as well as Algonquian tribes, and finally extended its domain to the Mississippi. In this war of imperialism the Hurons were early involved and their confederacy was destroyed. The fragments of the broken tribes fled westward along the Great lakes and after generations of wandering grouped themselves about the remnant of the Tionontati, whose social system had survived in a form somewhat resembling that of the days of its power. A homogeneous people finally emerged from the ruin of the Hurons. They retained many of the religious conceptions of the old Hurons. The name of the new tribe was the ancient name "Wendoot," which went through various forms and ended as "Wyandot."

This is the origin of the Wyandots of historic times, who were finally seated in the Sandusky country in northern Ohio. Some of them retained a slight attachment to the Roman church, but the majority had relapsed into paganism. In the year 1816 John Stewart, a free negro, appeared among them as a volunteer missionary of the Methodist Episcopal church, and founded at Upper Sandusky the Wyandot mission, the first mission ever established in the world by the Methodist Episcopal church. In

1843 the Wyandots, having sold their possessions in Ohio, moved to the forks of the Missouri and Kansas rivers, where they settled on lands purchased from the Delawares, in what is now Wyandotte county, Kansas. In 1855 they dissolved their tribal government and became citizens of the United States. They took their lands in severalty. Many of them were not competent to battle successfully in that fierce competition which civilization imposes on individuals. After the civil war the majority of the members of the tribe went to the Indian territory, now Oklahoma, where they secured by purchase a reservation of twenty thousand acres near Seneca, Missouri, and there they may be found to this day. They number now about three hundred. There is not a full-blood among them; indeed, there was never a Wyandot of pure blood even in Kansas. In 1843, when the tribe went west, the last Wyandot of full blood, who had lived and died in Canada, opposite Detroit, had been dead twenty-three years.

In April, 1881, I arrived at the little whistling station of Tiblow, in Wyandotte county, Kansas, sixteen miles up the Kansas river from Kansas City. In November, 1883, I was elected county clerk of Wyandotte county. In the discharge of the duties of that office I found that the absentee Wyandots were being rapidly divested of their lands through the tax laws. While the process was legal, it was, nevertheless, the rankest sort of fraud. Whatever I could do through my office to help these Indians I always did. On one occasion I saved Matthias Splitlog the sum of forty-five thousand dollars. The attorneys for the Missouri Pacific railroad had planned to take fifty-five acres of his land for use as the present Cypress yards for ten thousand dollars. Through my action the road paid him fifty-five thousand dollars. The Indian retains yet that fine quality now almost lost to civilized people — gratitude. Splitlog never forgot this favor. I was pressed to visit the home of the famous "millionaire Indian" on the Cowskin, a beautiful stream in the Ozarks. He was a good business man and a mechanic of remarkable ability. He built a steamboat for operation on the Missouri river during the civil war. The engine he made himself and, while it was admitted that it was one of great power, none but Splitlog could operate it. He finally sold the boat, but

the purchasers were compelled to stipulate for his services as engineer. There were new principles in the construction of that engine which Splitlog never revealed. When they are rediscovered steam will perform many times its present work in industry and engines of other types may be rendered more efficient.

Splitlog was a thorough pagan, though I believe he belonged to some church; perhaps he was a Methodist. Through his influence I saw the pagan ceremonies which were at that time observed by some of the Wyandots, though they were, for the most part, concealed from Christians. I began to study the Wyandot language and made an effort to discover all that remained of the ancient Huron cosmology and religious system. I continued in this work long after Splitlog's death. It is the object of this paper to set forth this old Huron system as I found it in the Indian territory more than two hundred years after the destruction of the Huron confederacy. It is not to be expected that it will conform to what the Jesuits recorded of the Huron beliefs in the days of their missions. There will appear innovations made by the Christian religion, for any institution can produce some modifications by constant effort during two centuries. And this is not to be taken to mean that there were not devout Christians among the Wyandots, for there were many such. These gave up the old system entirely; though in most instances the Indian, when converted, does not abandon his old belief — he takes on another one. The splendid ritual of the Roman church appealed to him and it had many adherents. There were still a few Catholics among the Wyandots when I was engaged in my work there, but in general that creed did not take permanent root in the nation of the Hurons.[2]

I found that some knowledge of the Huron cosmology remained with most of the Wyandots, but to a few only could I go with confidence that what I should obtain would prove of value. Splitlog himself knew much, especially of the doings of the great council composed of what I have called the "minor gods." The sage of the Wyandots, however, was George Wright. He was versed in Indian philosophy, law, customs, tradition, his-

[2] Religion in the abstract is an evolution toward truth even from the first dim and obscure conceptions of it by a people. In most systems there are found contradictions. These come from the retention of conceptions after they have been superseded by others coming in as the result of knowledge and experience, or of necessity.

tory, and the cosmology of the Hurons as it existed at the time of my investigations among the Wyandots. He knew the languages of the Wyandots, the Seneca, the Cayuga, the Shawnee, the Quapaw, and of minor tribes in the northeast part of the Indian territory. For years he was an interpreter at the Quapaw agency. From him I secured most of what I learned of the religious conceptions of the latter-day Hurons. Wright was of the Wolf clan of the Wyandot tribe, and his name, "Hashetra," signifies "the footprint of the wolf."[3]

My work extended intermittently over a period of about twenty years. I was given the name "Dehenyanteh" by an intelligent and prominent member of the Snake clan. Later I was formally adopted into the family of Allen Johnson, or Mrs. Allen Johnson, as in the Wyandot nation the wife is the head of the family. This adoption made me a member of the Deer clan and I was called "Toodarezhu," the name of the full-grown male deer. As applied to me it meant "great deer," as I was "raised up" to fill the place of the Half-King, the head chief of the Wyandots at Upper Sandusky in the time of the revolutionary war. Mrs. Johnson was of his family and was also of the Deer clan. I had conferred upon me the royal title of the Half-King, whose clan name I had just been given. He had borne that rarely revived office of *Sarstarratse*, the highest known to the Wyandot political system, which came down possibly from the supreme federal official of the old Huron confederacy. I was the first to be invested with it after the death of the Half-King, which occurred at Detroit about 1780.

John Cleves Symmes must have secured his ideas of the universe from the Wyandots; for, by their plan, the various worlds

[3] The first time I went to see George Wright I brought him a present of flour, meat, and other food, for he was blind and unable to work. He talked freely until he supposed he had said enough to offset in value the food I had brought him. Then he closed up as tight as a clam. When my friends inquired the cause of this action, he said that it was summer and the air was full of spirits which listened to what he was saying. Among these were souls of ancient Wyandots, he had no doubt. If they should hear him make any mistakes in reciting the ancient stories, they would be offended and might do him harm. "Tell the gentleman to come back next winter. These souls do not like cold and are absent in winter. They are uncomfortable and go away to find a pleasant country. Next winter I will tell the gentleman anything I know." Thereafter I visited Wright only in the winter, when critical and eavesdropping souls could not trouble us.

with which mortals have had to do, or shall have to do, lie one above the other and number four altogether. The one we inhabit was called the lower world. It was often spoken of as "the great island," though in fact the Wyandots believed that the great island was but a part of the lower world. The one immediately above us, and above the sky, was the upper world. The world above that was also called the upper world, but when it was spoken of it was distinguished from the first of that name, and I have called it the second upper world. The world beneath us was called "the land of the little people." It was a part of the lower world, the Mud Turtle having made it while digging the hole through the great island for the use of the sun in returning from the west during the night to rise again in the east on the morrow. But it was spoken of always as a lower world when the whole system of worlds was under consideration.

The Wyandots began their story of the creation with the lower world and the two upper worlds already in existence.[4] They said that down to a certain period there was no death in the

[4] The principal characters in the creation were: (1) Hoomayoowaneh, the ruler of the upper world, the second upper world, and the lower world; (2) the wife of Hoomayoowaneh, the woman who fell down from heaven, and mother of the twin sons, the terrestrial gods; (3) the great council, composed of the totemic animals of the Wyandots, the sessions of which were attended by the other animals and birds; (4) the twin sons born on the great island of the miraculous conception of the woman when she ate the flowers plucked from the tree of light. Hoomayoowaneh and his wife I have called the "celestial gods." I have called the twins the "terrestrial gods," and the totemic animals composing the great council I have called the "minor gods." This is my own designation of these primal beings and the terms are of my own making. They were determined on for convenience and are in no sense to be taken as of Wyandot origin.

In the lower world the twin brothers were troubled by the monsters which inhabited it. These were referred to as serpents, even when they possessed the forms of different animals. The snakes or serpents dwelt in the Great lakes. They were of immense size, some of them being hundreds of feet long and proportionately large. The rivers connecting the lakes were but the channels worn by them in crawling from lake to lake. They were never exterminated, though many of them were slain. They were malevolent gods and did not hesitate to oppose even Hoomayoowaneh.

The Wyandots termed any animal, object, or force which exerted magic power a "hooki," or, if a female, an "ooki." The monsters were hookies or ookies, as they were male or female. The priests or medicine men were hookies, as were their magic preparations. The earth was filled with evil spirits, which were always more plentiful and more potent in summer than in winter. By the Wyandots I heard them spoken of as hookies and ookies. Even the souls of the dead were sometimes so called, and feared.

upper world, though it finally became possible to secure a separation of the soul and the body, which was a voluntary action. Those so transformed might go into the second upper world. The people in the upper world differed little from the Wyandots as they were before the coming of the white man. They were believed to have had the same social and political systems as those found among the primitive Wyandots. The head chief of that land was Hoomayoowaneh. It was impossible to get an exact translation of this term, but it means "big man" or "big chief," or it might mean also "mighty ruler." The idea of "greatness" is absent from his name, the word *zhu* being the word for "great." *Waneh* means "big" in various Iroquoian dialects — as *carondawaneh*, "big tree," a name for men in some tribes.

The upper world had no sun nor moon nor any stars, for it had no need for any of these. It was lighted by an immense tree bearing a great profusion of yellow flowers. These flowers were large and pendent and were composed of innumerable small flowers.[5] The first people in the upper world to undergo death were a man and his wife, who chose this process believing that they might obtain entrance to the second upper world. In this they were right, but they found themselves still under the rule of Hoomayoowaneh. They found, too, in that world a different tree of light, and there were forests of this tree. Some of the trees bore yellow blossoms and some bore white ones. When the leaves fell off and dried they were smoked in pipes by the people there. These were tobacco trees, the progenitors of our tobacco. The tree of light was a sacred object. No one was permitted to touch it except the priests, who, on proper occasion and with due ceremonies, might lay hands on it.

These persons who first tasted death had a daughter who was beautiful of form and countenance and had great supernatural power. She was taken to wife by Hoomayoowaneh. They had no children. One day when Hoomayoowaneh was away hunting his wife plucked and ate some of the flowers of the tree of light. Its luster was immediately dimmed, and conception was at once

[5] See the pamphlet by J. N. B. Hewitt, the greatest authority on the Iroquois. The story told by the Wyandots is much like that of Mr. Hewitt, but there are marked differences.

caused in the woman. She was frightened and fled, and a great sickness fell upon her. Hoomayoowaneh with the priests attempted to restore the tree, but without success. He had the woman brought to the tree, for he wished to have her healed of her sickness. The priests said that by digging among the roots of the tree a medicine would be found which would restore her to health. She was placed on a mat where the priests were digging. Suddenly the tree sank down and fell into the lower world, and in falling its branches caught and dragged the woman through the break in the upper world.

In the lower world there was only water, with a little bare and sterile land where animals lived in darkness, want, and discomfort. The woman appeared in the rent in the upper world with her arms spread above her head. She was as tall as the tallest tree and she glowed with a light equal to that of the sun. Heno, the thunder god, was sent by her husband to protect her, and he broke over the lower world with such crashes that he startled all who dwelt there. This was the first thunder heard in the lower world. Two swans — *yoohera* — were swimming in this great water. They were very large — half a tree tall. When they saw the woman falling down from heaven, one said to the other: "What shall we do with this woman?"

"Throw our bodies together and receive her on our backs," the other replied.

When they had done this, the swan who had spoken first inquired: "What shall we do with this woman? We cannot forever bear her up."

"Call a council of all the swimmers and water tribes," replied the other swan.

This they did; and thus was convoked the first session of the great council.[6]

[6] The totemic animals of the Wyandots were those standing at the heads of the clans of the tribe. There were twelve clans, some of which are now extinct. These animals were Big Turtle, Little Turtle, Mud Turtle, Wolf, Bear, Beaver, Deer, Porcupine, Striped Turtle, Highland Turtle, Snake, and Hawk. The clans themselves were called (1) Tengowwishhiyoowanehrono, the people of the Big Turtle, or the clan which bears up the earth or great island; (2) Tehnyehrono, the people of the Little Turtle, or the clan which keeps the heavens; (3) Yanesterono, the people of the Mud Turtle, or the clan which digs through the earth; (4) Tehnaresquarono, the people of the Wolf, or the clan which smells a bone; (5) Tehnyoyenkrono, the people of the Bear, or the clan of the claws; (6) Tsootihatezhatooterono, the people of the

The Big Turtle presided over the great council, which did not know at first what action to take. But it desired to provide a place where the woman who had fallen down from heaven could live. The Big Turtle said that if some of the earth which fell down with the tree of light could be obtained he would see what he could do with it. This earth and the tree lay on the bottom under the great water and shone with a brilliancy which made them plainly visible. One animal after another of those who were spectators dived into the great deep to get some of the earth, but they were unsuccessful and came up lifeless. The Toad then said she would try. She was gone long, but at last floated up to the surface, dead. There was a little of the sacred earth in her mouth. This the Little Turtle spread upon the back of the Big Turtle, when, lo! there immediately grew there the "great island," as the Wyandots called North America. And it rests yet upon the Big Turtle's back. He stands upon the bottom under the great water to bear it up. When he is wearied by his immense burden and shifts about to rest himself a little, the great island shakes, and the Wyandots cry out, "He moves his feet! He moves his feet!" Thus they account for the earthquake. In gratitude for the sacrifice and achievement of the Toad the Wyandots call her "Mashootaah," "our grandmother," and hold her in reverence to this day.

The woman arose from the backs of the swans and went to dwell upon the great island. One of these swans lives now in the Gulf of Mexico and the other lives in the Arctic ocean, guarding the two extremities of the great island.[7]

Beaver, or the clan of the house-builders; (7) Tehndaararono, the people of the Deer, or the clan of the horns; (8) Yereheserono, the people of the Porcupine, or the clan of the quills; (9) Manohookasherono, the people of the Striped Turtle, or the clan which carries the stripes or colors; (10) Yetozhurono, the people of the Highland Turtle, or the clan which carries the house; (11) Tehngontrono, the people of the Snake, or the clan which carries the trail; (as this clan was an offshoot of the Deer clan, it was sometimes called the little clan of the horns); (12) Tehndesorono, the people of the Hawk, or the clan of the wings — sometimes, the clan of the feathers.

[7] In my *Wyandott folk-lore* (Topeka, 1899), I did not use this version of the creation myth. The Wyandots had many myths of which various versions are told. This resulted from the manner of the formation of the tribe. Each remnant brought into the tribe the version of a common cosmic story held by its tribe before the great dispersion. This enriched the lore of the Wyandots beyond that of any other Iroquoian people. There were several other forms of this creation concept in the Wyandot nation, some of which are of such a nature that they could not be pub-

When the woman went to dwell on the great island she was in despair. She went in the direction she was told to go, and from the summit of a hill she saw far down a stream a lodge from which smoke was rising. She came near it and sat upon a stone a little apart from the door. There came out a woman, or the form of one, from the lodge. It was the soul of her mother sent by her husband to comfort her.[8] The woman who had fallen down from heaven entered the lodge and lived in it. When she went inside there was no light left on the outside, for she had become the source of light for the lower world; until she came all had been a misty twilight approaching darkness. Having seen the light, the great council desired that the lower world have it constantly and it therefore assembled to devise a light. The Little Turtle said: "Let me go into the sky. I will put a light there that will shine in the absence of the woman who fell down from the upper world." This was agreed to. A great cloud was called down, which rolled over the great water. Heno rode in it. Thunder rolled through it, and red lightning broke from its borders. In it were bushes, trees, and streams of water. The Little Turtle went into these streams and was carried into the sky. There, from the lightning, she kindled a flame which surged and burned and rose to an immense height. Its light did not reach the bounds of the lower world, but at the hut of the woman its heat was intolerable.

This sun was not satisfactory and the great council called down the Little Turtle to attend a session convened to make some modification of it. It was then determined to make the sun a

lished. In one very fine version the condition of the woman came about in the ordinary course of wedlock. The monsters of the lower world were aware of her condition. By their supernatural powers they knew that the children to be born would destroy them, and they endeavored to prevent their birth. They invaded the upper world and made war on Hoomayoowaneh. In the battle which raged there the tree of light was uprooted and the woman was cast into the hole from which it had been torn, and the tree was then pushed back over her. But the monsters did not know that the roots of the tree had penetrated the whole distance through the upper world and that the pit left by uprooting it extended through to the under side. Both the woman and the tree fell through this rent into the lower world. In one form of the concept the tree of light was pushed down upon the woman with such force that the upper world was rent by the impact and both woman and tree fell. The reception of the woman by the swans is practically the same in all the Wyandot versions, as is the formation and action of the great council.

[8] In some versions of the story this was the soul of her grandmother.

person, that is, to give it life, set a circuit for it, and make it run about the sky. The Mud Turtle was directed to dig a hole or passageway through the lower world under the great island for the use of the sun in going back to rise in the east every morning. The sun was sometimes unmindful of his duty and loitered in the subterranean way, to the discomfort of the lower world. The great council then directed that the Little Turtle make the moon to be a wife for the sun. The sun became cruel to his wife, the moon, though she bore him myriads of children — all the stars which have courses in the sky. He drew her into the passage under the great island and would have slain her but for the interference of the Little Turtle. The new moon was all that was left of the moon when plucked from the burning fury of her lord. Gradually she recovered her original form. When she had attained this, however, she sickened and decayed, diminishing daily until she finally disappeared. When next seen she was a curve of burnished silver lying just above the western horizon. She increased in effulgence and regained her former fullness and beauty, hoping once more to come into favor with her husband. Failing in this, she again wasted away. This process has been going on to this day, and must continue until the end of time.

Because of her labors in the sky, the Little Turtle was called "Watronyononeh," "the keeper of the heavens." Her chariot was the great comet, sometimes visible to the people of the lower world.[9]

From her work of digging this underworld passage for the nocturnal use of the sun the Mud Turtle turned aside long enough to fashion under the great island a delightful country of vast extent. It was made for the use of the Wyandots, whom she knew would inhabit the lower world after their lives ended here. To it the souls of all animals fit for food went also after death. To care for this land of souls the Mud Turtle created the "little people," who were very diminutive — not above two feet in height. They were born in pairs and they worked in pairs, two of them being a force sufficient to accomplish any purpose. They

[9] Once Splitlog and I were out at night, probably in 1883 or 1884. Just before daylight a great comet became visible flaming far across the heavens. He exclaimed: "The chariot of our grandmother, the Little Turtle!" Then he told me the story of the work of the Little Turtle.

came up to the surface of the lower world through the "living rock," that is, through native cliffs and masses of stone extending far down into the earth, and they assisted the Wyandots in their struggles against the monsters encountered in the lower world. Two of the little people were sent to exterminate the witch buffaloes that preyed on the animals visiting the Big Bone Licks in Kentucky. They slew all the monsters but one, which by a mighty leap bounded into the north, the realm of eternal snows, and he lives there solitary and alone to this day. The bones of the others were for ages plainly to be seen lying about the Big Bone Licks. Even the white people saw some of them there. The Mud Turtle lives now in the land of the little people.

The birth of the terrestrial gods was in this wise. For having eaten of the forbidden flowers the woman who fell down from heaven bore twins in the lodge of her mother. The first-born was good; the second one was bad. In his birth the latter purposely and with malice killed his mother, but her soul remained with her first-born to help him. Hoomayoowaneh directed how the twins should be named. The first-born was called "Tsesta," "Tsesehhowngk," or "Tsesehhowoongk," "the Man of Fire." The second one was called "Taweskareh," or "Taweskaroongk," "the Man of Flint." The Flint did evil continually, though in the olden times there was no moral good and evil among the Hurons. Whatever benefited them as a people was good; anything which worked them harm was evil. In the days when these stories were gathered, however, the good and evil done by these brothers had assumed a moral significance. The Man of Fire could prevail over the Man of Flint, but he disliked to be forever striving with him. In the hope of securing peace it was agreed to divide the lower world, each brother to have a half which he might fashion to suit himself and create therein whatever he had in mind. The Wyandots came to believe that the Mississippi river had been the dividing line. The Man of Fire had the eastern part. In it he made everything good and useful for the coming people. The rivers had two currents, one of which flowed up and the other, down, so that the future Wyandot could travel upstream without having to paddle his canoe. In his portion, the Flint made everything bad, very bad. Icicles miles long hung from rugged rocks which towered almost to the sky. Mosquitoes

as large as hawks rose by millions from fetid swamps. Monsters crawled and walked and flew. No article of food was provided for a human being.

There was, however, a condition to this partition of the lower world. When the two creations had been completed each brother might go over the land of the other and modify the creations he found there, but neither could destroy wholly any work of the other. The evil one reduced the corn from a plant bearing a hundred ears down to one producing only one or two ears, and these were much smaller than they originally had been made. The bean, the squash, and the fruits were all reduced in size and were made difficult to produce. The rivers made to give the coming man so much pleasure particularly displeased the Man of Flint. He thrust his great hand into this water and gave it a mighty swish. The currents mixed and ever afterwards flowed in but one direction. The good one made such modifications as he could of the works he found so bad, but despite his utmost efforts much to vex mankind remained in the lower world.

The minor gods were much offended at the course of the evil one and eventually they left the lower world to dwell with the Little Turtle in the sky land. The Deer was the first to go. He induced the rainbow to build for him "the beautiful way," or "the path of burning colors," and along its enchanting course he passed into the sky. The Bear went up to force the Deer to come down. The battle they fought convulsed the universe, and the Wolf was sent up to make them desist. This he did; but the blood of the conflict fell down upon the trees of the great island, making them all the colors which they show in the autumn. Every year at the time when this battle occurred the trees take on these wonderful colors.

Not until the minor gods had left the lower world did the terrestrial gods concern themselves with peopling the great island. Then they presented themselves before Hoomayoowaneh and asked for people. The Man of Fire was given the Wyandots, whom he led into the lower world. The Man of Flint was given other tribes, some good and some bad, whom he brought into his part of the lower world. All these peoples increased and divisions took place among them. Nations arose and tongues were multiplied. Wars resulted. Taweskareh led bad people against

Tsesta and the Wyandots, and even invaded the sky to make war on the minor gods. All nature implored Tsesta to go into the sky and bring back the minor gods. He consented to go and make the effort. He took the down from the breasts of the two swans to scatter along his path so that he could find his way back. But the minor gods refused to come, and he returned in sorrow. The swans' down which he scattered in his travels through the heavens remains there to this day as the milky way.

Seeing that nothing else would avail, Tsesta made war upon the evil one. One day it was found that no water was in the springs, and none could be found in the lakes or streams. Tsesta led his people along the way of burning colors. From there, looking into the sky, he saw the evil one holding a great bag of skin into which he had gathered all the water of the springs, the lakes, and the streams. Against his adversary did Tsesta then bend his mighty bow. He shot an arrow — the shaft of a towering pine — into the bag held by Taweskareh. The bag was rent and torn, and the water escaped and deluged the lower world. Creation was destroyed. But Tsesta led his people into the mysterious forest, through which passed the way of burning colors, though it was forbidden to mortals. They dwelt there and escaped destruction. When the waters had subsided he resolved to slay his brother Taweskareh. Armed with the horns of the deer he followed the evil one into the heavens. Taweskareh was armed with blades of the swamp flag, but he could not stand before his brother, who pursued him through the sky and into the lower world. He was struck by the horns and his blood flowed out and congealed into hard flints to impede the pursuit of the good one. The two ran through all the great island, but finally the evil one was beaten down and slain.[10]

The war between the terrestrial gods destroyed life in this lower world. Flood, fire, and the north wind consumed all life. Trees nor animals, streams nor fishes, fruits nor flowers remained.

Tsesta saw that it was necessary to reproduce the creations of his hand; and not those alone, for he found it his duty to

[10] The Wyandots in the Indian territory came to believe that the last battle had been fought in the Ozark mountains. There is an abundance of broken chert there and some of the Indians believed that the small sharp stones were only the congealed blood of Taweskareh.

re-create life for all the regions of Taweskareh. The first requirement was to find a place of refuge for the Wyandots or Hurons, for it was not possible for them to remain in the mysterious forest beside the beautiful way of the rainbow. Far to the north Tsesta built a city under ground, which he called "Yoowatayo." Into this subterranean dwelling place he brought the Wyandots. There they were thrown into a torpid state. The functions of life were suspended; time did not count, and they did not grow old; of the things that transpired they knew nothing. They were attended by the woman who fell down from heaven. For light she had a flaming torch made of the fires of Heno. It was a weapon and with it she beat back the monsters which would have devoured her helpless children.

In the re-creation of the life forms of this lower world Tsesta was bound to conform to the creation and modification as worked out by his brother and himself in the beginning. But it was not ordained that he should reproduce all the old forms. Many of the monsters made by Taweskareh were not brought to life again.

The work of re-creation engaged Tsesta for an immense period of time. In this labor he found another people, but whether they were of this world or another we cannot say. They had harnessed the stag to the sledge. Three of these stags Tsesta compelled to draw his sledge as he replaced life in the polar lands.

When at last his work was done Tsesta came again to the Yoowatayo, where he rested from his labors. A gleam of light broke into the subterranean city, and through the opening at which it entered Tsesta looked out over the world; for it was for ages too primitive to sustain a people.

After the lapse of a long time the earth was ready for the use of man and able to sustain him. One day in spring Tsesta went forth to view his creations, and saw that the works of his hands had ripened and matured. The lower world was again ready to receive his people. Nature called to him and required their presence. The woman who fell down from heaven said to Tsesta: "Lead my children forth. Scatter them abroad in the lower world. I will remain in this city. At death each Wyandot shall pass through the Yoowatayo on the way to the land of the little people, there to remain forever."

Then Heno shook the world. He rolled over the great water, and the Yoowatayo was rent asunder. The sun shone in and the Wyandots revived and stood up. A nation stood marshaled to pass into a new world waiting for it. All the re-creation chanted a song of welcome. The world was decked with flowers. And man, upon his entrance into this new world, was greeted with hosannas of joy.

William E. Connelley

Kansas State Historical Society
Topeka

FEDERAL OPERATION OF SOUTHERN RAILROADS DURING THE CIVIL WAR

Prior to the American civil war there had been considerable speculation, particularly in Europe, as to the possible use and importance of railroads in military maneuvers. In numerous cases troops and supplies had been transported; but with one exception no attempt had been made to use the railroads as an integral part of a military campaign. This one exception was the Italian campaign of 1859 and even in this instance the railroads had not been used very extensively.[1] Consequently, at the opening of the civil war the United States was confronted with an unsolved problem of the greatest magnitude and importance and one upon which the outcome of the war was largely dependent. The success of the solution may be shown by a survey of the results and also by the fact that similar plans were used later by other countries, particularly notable being the German use of railroads during the Franco-Prussian war.

Before the time of the civil war the idea of the use of railroads in the United States for war purposes had been conceived solely in relation to possible aid in coast defense and even this function was not considered important. In 1839 Major General Gaines, in command of the western division of the army of the United States, had suggested the government-aided construction of seven trunk lines as an adjunct to coast defense and went into considerable detail as to estimates for route, cost, and so forth.[2]

As a result of Gaines's suggestion, Colonel J. J. Abert of the topographical engineers was called upon to give his opinion of the plan and reported in 1840 that it was impossible because of the difficulties and the cost of construction.[3] In 1851 the secre-

[1] The first chapter of Edwin A. Pratt, *The rise of rail-power in war and conquest, 1833-1914* (London, 1915), gives the best general account of the early use of railroads for war purposes.

[2] *House executive documents*, 26 congress, 1 session, no. 206, pp. 126-130; reprinted *ibid.*, 37 congress, 2 session, no. 92, pp. 180-184.

[3] *Ibid.*, 196.

tary of the navy sent to various naval officers a questionnaire concerning the value of railroads in coast defense. The answers as a rule minimized the value of such aid and placed most reliance in coast defenses of one kind or another. Such incidents as these show the general feeling in the United States concerning the use of railroads in war time: the only way in which railroads could ever be used for military purposes was as a very minor aid toward coast defense.[4] Consequently, when the civil war opened no one had any idea either as to the importance of railroads in military operations or as to the possible organization of an adequate department.

In 1860 the south had a total of 8,600 miles of railroad in operation east of the Mississippi and south of Maryland.[5] Nowhere, however, was there good service. The only through connection was between Memphis and Richmond and even in this route three changes had to be made.[6] The other supposedly complete east-and-west route lay between Vicksburg and Charleston, but the continuity was broken by a gap between Selma, Alabama, and Meridian, Mississippi, necessitating a detour through Mobile.[7] Furthermore, the southern roads were usually distinguished by lack of equipment, by poor roadbeds and tracks, by different gauge tracks, by numerous gaps in the lines, and by the fact that at most junction points such as Chattanooga, Knoxville, Lynchburg, Savannah, Augusta, Raleigh, and Petersburg the various railroads did not make connections, so that all passengers and freight had to be transferred from one line to the next.[8]

These inherent difficulties in the southern system of transportation were augmented in time of war by the confederate destruction of stock and property before the advancing federal troops. By the time the union armies had occupied a railroad line, the track had been at least partially destroyed, the build-

[4] *House executive documents,* 37 congress, 2 session, no. 92, p. 196.

[5] *American railroad journal,* vol. 17.

[6] Henry M. Flint, *The railroads of the United States; their history and statistics* (Philadelphia, 1868), 50, 51.

[7] Charles W. Ramsdell, "The confederate government and the railroads," in the *American historical review,* 22: 797.

[8] *Ibid.,* 796. Lee tried to close the Petersburg gap at various times during the war, but he was never successful. The confederate government finally closed the Selma and Danville gaps.

ings had been burned, and the rolling stock had been either removed or destroyed. The northern authorities then had the task of practically rebuilding the entire line before it could be used.

The importance of all railroad lines was recognized very early in the war and therefore the principal problem was the organization of an army department adequate for the reconstruction and operation of all roads captured.

The control of railroads needed for the army rested at first with the departments of the army in which the railroads were situated.[9] At times special officers were detailed to manage particular portions of the work, and at other times the quartermaster's department was given control. It very early became apparent that there must be some sort of correlation between the various portions of railroad under construction and in operation; and to secure this result, Thomas Scott, the assistant secretary of war, who was vice president of the Pennsylvania lines both before and after the war, was given general supervision in the fall of 1861, without, however, any power other than that of recommendation.[10] As his assistant he appointed R. F. Morley, who was in active charge of the work.[11] This stage of development corresponded closely to that reached by the southern system and was entirely inadequate.[12] No officer with only supervisory powers could hope to get unified action from different army departments; and the idea of an advisory head was hardly more than introduced when it was dropped, the end no doubt being hastened by the feeling that Scott had not lost all his interest in the Pennsylvania railroad.

To give legislative sanction to military railway operation congress on January 31, 1862, after a perfunctory debate [13] passed a bill giving the president the right to take over all railroads necessary for the successful operation of the war.[14] Although this bill gave permission to take over northern as well as south-

[9] *The war of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies* (Washington, 1880-1901), series 1, vol. 5, p. 999.

[10] *Ibid.*, series 3, vol. 1, p. 228.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 674, 675.

[12] Compare these conditions with the conditions in the south as described in Ramsdell, "The confederate government and the railroads," in the *American historical review*, 22: 794-810.

[13] *Congressional globe*, 37 congress, 2 session, 506-555.

[14] *Ibid.*, 304, 305.

ern railroads, it was never found necessary to do so except in the case of some small lines in Pennsylvania which were operated by the government for a few days at the time of the battle of Gettysburg. Southern roads, however, were taken over and operated as fast as they were captured.

As the first result of this bill, efforts were made to centralize and to harmonize railroad management. On February 4, Daniel C. McCallum was made "military director and superintendent of railroads in the United States." McCallum was an architect and engineer of considerable ability and had at one time been general manager of the Erie lines.[15] Though according to his appointment he had absolute control over all military railroads, the facts did not agree with the fiction. Prior to McCallum's appointment, J. B. Anderson, formerly of the Louisville and Nashville railroad, had been appointed by General Sherman (November 2, 1861) as railroad director in the department of the Ohio,[16] and after McCallum's appointment he remained in active independent command of western railroads for two years. In the east the same condition existed. On May 28, 1862, Herman Haupt was appointed chief of construction and transportation in the department of the Rappahannock.[17] Haupt had had more experience in railroad matters than any other man employed in the department and was also well known because of his connection with the Hoosac tunnel project.[18] For a year and a half following his appointment he had active independent charge of all Virginia railroad operations. While Haupt and Anderson were in supreme command in the east and west respectively, McCallum confined himself to work in the north — the securing of cars and engines and the recruiting of men for the construction corps. It is of great credit to McCallum that during this period, when his authority overlapped that of Anderson and Haupt, he almost entirely avoided any conflict with them.[19]

The natural tendency of this system of multiple control was

[15] *International encyclopedia.*

[16] *Rebellion records,* series 1, vol. 16, p. 301.

[17] *Ibid.,* vol. 12, p. 274.

[18] *Reminiscences of General Herman Haupt* ([Milwaukee], 1901).

[19] *Ibid.,* 53, 135. At these two places in his reminiscences Haupt mentions the conflict in power. On May 26 and September 2, 1862, he made complaints to Stanton.

for it to reduce itself to a single organization with a single head. The first man to be eliminated in this process was Haupt. In his memoirs, Haupt claims that he was removed because he would not accept a commission. He states also that influential enemies wished to connect him permanently with the army in order to get rid of him.[20] On the other hand, Secretary of the Navy Welles mentions in his diary that a considerable amount of fraud had been discovered in Haupt's department.[21] Be that as it may, the result was the same; on September 14, 1863, Haupt was relieved of his command, and his work was turned over to McCallum.[22] Thus only Anderson and McCallum were left in the field.

Anderson soon followed in Haupt's path. Up to the summer and fall of 1863 little attention had been paid to the western railroads, but the farther the army advanced the more necessary good rail communication became, so that by the time Chattanooga was taken in November good railroads were absolutely essential. As the responsibility grew greater, the weakness of Anderson's administration became evident. Work was poorly done or not done at all, so that frequently the army actually lacked supplies. Such conditions could not exist if the campaign was to be successful and protests and complaints were made continually to Stanton.[23] Action was taken on December 19, when McCallum was ordered to go to Chattanooga with all his construction crew that could be spared and to report on railroad conditions at that place.[24] This he did, and in his report of January 19, 1864, he severely criticized both the conditions in the west and Anderson's management.[25] On February 4, 1864, just two years after McCallum's original appointment, Anderson was removed; and all railroads, both east and west — with

20 Haupt, *Reminiscences,* 261-264.

21 *Diary of Gideon Welles, secretary of the navy under Lincoln and Johnson* (New York, 1911), 1: 511.

22 Haupt, *Reminiscences,* 264.

23 Andrew Johnson to Stanton, in *Rebellion records,* series 1, vol. 31, part 3, p. 14; C. A. Dana to Stanton, *ibid.,* vol. 31, part 2, p. 61; Grant to Halleck, *ibid.,* vol. 32, part 2, p. 172. Besides being charged with inefficiency, Anderson was accused of favoring the Louisville and Nashville railroad.

24 *Rebellion records,* series 1, vol. 31, part 3, p. 444; series 3, vol. 5, p. 981.

25 *Ibid.,* series 1, vol. 32, pp. 143-145.

the exception of a few minor lines in the southwest — were united under the management of McCallum.[26]

After February 4, 1864, the organization of the military railway department was substantially complete. McCallum, in supreme command, was responsible only to the secretary of war, and divided his time between securing equipment and men from the north and superintending personally the major operations in the south. During the summer and fall of 1864 McCallum spent most of his time in active charge of construction work in the west. When Sherman started for the sea McCallum went north, but he came south again for the final operations around Richmond.

The organization of the department, as perfected by McCallum, was notably complete and effective. In each larger division, such as the department of the Mississippi, was a general superintendent of transportation and a general superintendent of construction, each directly responsible to McCallum. Under the superintendent of transportation were the superintendents of division points; under these came the superintendents of each road, and from there the organization was thoroughly worked out down to the lowest subordinate.[27]

In the construction department the chief engineer had immediately under him the division engineers. Each division engineer had normally under his supervision about eight hundred men; and these men were so apportioned and equipped that each division was a complete unit, thoroughly fitted to undertake any form of construction work from laying tracks to building stations. For this end each division was subdivided into seven sections, and each section was completely equipped and commanded.[28]

The whole military railway organization had certain definite characteristics. Each man was allowed considerable discretion in his own field but was directly responsible to a single supervisor. Conversely, each man had only one boss and there was no danger of conflicting orders. The whole department was highly centralized, each person, in the last analysis, being direct-

[26] *Rebellion records*, series 1, vol. 32, p. 329.

[27] *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 2 session, no. 1, vol. 3, pp. 272, 273.

[28] *Ibid.*, 274, 275.

ly connected with McCallum as the supreme head. Promotion was given according to length of service and consequently the same men remained in control throughout the war, thus giving the service the benefit of their experience. Orders came from Stanton, McCallum, or the commanding general in the field.[29]

The first beginnings of the construction corps were under Haupt and Anderson. In each case the work was at first done entirely by details of soldiers, but as time progressed a body of skilled carpenters was recruited or transferred, so that eventually the department performed all its own work.[30] The labor was hired, sometimes from the surrounding country, sometimes from Washington, and sometimes from the north; many negroes were used for the simpler tasks.[31] Great difficulty was experienced in procuring skilled railroad operators, especially locomotive engineers, because of the high wages paid by northern railroads.[32] All the men employed by the military railway department were civil employees and were paid wages in addition to their boarding and housing.[33] Some difficulties were very naturally experienced because of the feeling of superiority among the regular army officers, but this cause of trouble was eliminated by very strict orders from the war department.[34]

The equipment used on the southern roads came in most part from the north and was either bought or requisitioned. By the use of priority orders from Stanton, McCallum was able to secure a large share of the output of northern shops.[35] To supplement the material bought, cars and engines were commandeered from the northern roads, particularly from those in the west.[36] These conditions brought cars and engines from all roads into the south, a situation hitherto unknown. One of the

[29] *Rebellion records*, series 3, vol. 5, p. 1000.

[30] *Ibid.*, 969; *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 1 session, no. 1, part 1, p. 18; Haupt, *Reminiscences*, 47, 64.

[31] *House executive documents*, 38 congress, 2 session, no. 83, p. 137; *ibid.*, 37 congress, 3 session, no. 1, vol. 4, p. 79; *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman* (New York, 1875), 2: 400.

[32] *Rebellion records*, series 3, vol. 5, p. 949.

[33] For the number of men employed, see *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 2 session, no. 1, part 1, p. 210.

[34] *Rebellion records*, series 1, vol. 12, part 3, p. 598.

[35] *Ibid.*, series 3, vol. 5, p. 985.

[36] Sherman, *Memoirs*, 2: 11.

chief difficulties in using this rolling stock was the varying gauge of the southern roads. McCallum very ingeniously solved this problem by having some of the cars made with adjustable trucks so that they could be used on roads of different gauge.

For the repair of damaged cars and engines numerous machine shops were constructed in the south at such railroad centers as Nashville, Chattanooga, Stevenson, Huntsville, Knoxville, Memphis, and Columbus.[37] The most unusual project, however, was the building of a large rolling mill at Chattanooga, principally for the rerolling of damaged rails. The mill was authorized on February 17, 1864, and was completed by April 1, 1865, at a cost of $290,000.[38] Although the venture came too late to be of any assistance in the war, the mill ran long enough to prove that under government operation rails could be rerolled at a smaller cost than that of similar work in the north. Quite justly, the mill, together with its products, was disposed of at auction at the end of the war for $440,000,[39] leaving a profit of $150,000, or fifty per cent on a year's investment.

Railroad operation always followed the main movements of the army; consequently Virginia and Tennessee offered the greatest fields for railroad construction and operation. Almost with the opening of the war, railroads were taken over as essential parts of the campaigns in both these districts and varying amounts of line were operated continuously throughout the war. In general, the railways were torn up by the retreating confederates and bridges and stations were burned. As fast as the union army occupied new territory, the railroads had to be reconstructed and opened for use, and they were always subject to constant guerrilla raids. Frequently the army was driven back and the line was lost, which made necessary a second rebuilding after the next advance. Some lines were rebuilt in this way as many as six or seven times; especially was this true of those in Virginia, where the same ground was fought over so many times.[40]

Possibly the best method of showing the actual work accom-

[37] *Rebellion records*, series 3, vol. 4, p. 965.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 1 session, no. 1, vol. 3, part 1, p. 31.

[40] The Orange and Alexandria railroad of Virginia furnishes a good example of a road that was being continually destroyed and rebuilt.

plished by the railroad department and the speed with which it worked is to follow some single line through the war. The line from Nashville to Atlanta, composed of the Nashville and Chattanooga railroad and the Western and Atlantic railroad, formed the backbone of the movement to Atlanta; and because it was reconstructed at a time when the department had arrived at its highest state of efficiency, it may be used to show how the work was done.

In the Buell campaign of 1863 the road was opened as far as Stevenson, but it was lost when Buell retreated in the late fall.[41] It was recaptured by Rosecrans late in 1863 and was rebuilt to Chattanooga, all the material and rolling stock being obtained from the north.[42] When McCallum took charge in February, 1864, there were 151 miles of road in operation, which were used to furnish all the supplies of the army in the field. The line consisted of a single track of light 7 U rails on wooden stringers, laid on an unballasted mud road, and wrecks were consequently frequent.[43] McCallum at once set to work to relay the track with iron and to put in sidings. Within a month the road was able to supply more provisions than were needed. To get sufficient rolling stock, McCallum secured a requisition from Stanton giving him priority rights to the output of northern factories;[44] and in order to free the line for military traffic, he secured an order from General Sherman prohibiting all civil use.[45]

During the summer of 1864 occasional guerrilla raids took place, the most important being those of Wheeler, who destroyed seven miles of road between Nashville and Murfreesboro on September 1, and of Hood, who destroyed seven and three-fourths miles at about the same place in December.[46] Both breaks were repaired so rapidly that there was practically no interruption of traffic.

In March, 1864, the advance started from Chattanooga.[47] The task of the railroad department was to keep open the line from

41 *Rebellion records*, series 1, vol. 16, part 1, p. 298.
42 *Ibid.*, vol. 32, part 2, p. 131.
43 *Ibid.*, series 3, vol. 5, p. 982.
44 *Ibid.*, 985.
45 Sherman, *Memoirs*, 2: 10.
46 *Rebellion records*, series 3, vol. 5, p. 987.
47 *Ibid.*, 951.

Nashville to Chattanooga and to construct the road from Chattanooga forward as fast as the army advanced, both duties being absolutely essential because of the dependence of the army on the railroad for supplies. As a matter of fact, the railroad construction followed the army so closely that at one time the construction crew was within sight of the battle, while at another time it was delayed because a bridge which the confederates had fired was still burning. The day after Sherman entered Atlanta, trains arrived there from Chattanooga. Some of the best work of the construction crew was done in bridge-building. The bridge over the Etowah river, 600 feet long and 67 feet high, was finished in five days, and Chattahoochee bridge, 780 feet long and 92 feet high, was completed in four and one-half days.[48]

During the fall of 1864 Sherman outfitted his army at Atlanta in preparation for the march to the sea, and consequently it was of prime importance that the railroad connection should remain good.[49] At the same time the confederates sought in every way possible to cut off Sherman's supplies. The most extensive of the raids having this object was the one by Hood, who destroyed 35½ miles of track, 455 feet of bridges, and all supplies, railroad iron, and ties which the construction crew had collected, to say nothing of killing some of the crew itself. In spite of the fact that the track had to be brought from Nashville and the ties cut from trees along the road, the gap was closed and trains were running within seven and one-half days.[50] When Sherman left Atlanta on November 12, 1864, the whole railroad as far as Dalton was taken up and the track was carried to Nashville. Then, in July, 1865, the road was entirely rebuilt by order of General Thomas and 66 miles of track and 3,553 feet of bridges were constructed.[51]

During the entire war about 2,600 miles of railroad were operated by the government, embracing some forty-five lines and including at least four roads which were built entirely by the gov-

[48] *Rebellion records*, series 3, vol. 5, pp. 591, 592.

[49] *The Sherman letters. Correspondence between General and Senator Sherman from 1837 to 1891*, edited by Rachel Sherman Thorndike (New York, 1894), 236.

[50] *Rebellion records*, series 3, vol. 5, p. 952.

[51] Sherman, *Memoirs*, 2: 152, 171; *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 1 session, no. 1, vol. 4, part 1, p. 22.

ernment — the Brazos, Santiago, and Rio Grande, of Texas, the Louisville City railroad, of Kentucky, the City Point and Army Line, of Virginia,[52] and the St. Joseph's railroad, of Louisiana, not to mention the Nashville and Northwestern, which was incomplete at the outbreak of the war and which was finished by Andrew Johnson.[53]

The entire cost of military railways, as estimated by McCallum, was $30,000,000.[54] This estimate makes allowance for all receipts from private freight and for stock sold at the end of the war, some of which was never paid for, and does not include some items such as soldier labor; consequently the figure is at best only an approximation. But no matter how many qualifications are made, it seems inescapably true that the expense was quite reasonable in consideration of the work done.

When the war was over the railroads were returned to their owners, that is, provided a loyal board of directors had been chosen. The railroad companies were not charged for any repairs made on the roads and the United States was not to be responsible for any damage done, as it was thought that the one item would usually about balance the other. Each railroad was allowed to have all the equipment that it could identify as its own.[55]

Very naturally, the southern railroads immediately after the war were weak financially and it was a question whether many of them could collect enough equipment and rolling stock to operate. To alleviate this condition the president, by executive order of August 8, 1865, extended on October 14,[56] gave the southern railroads the right to purchase necessary stock from the supply on hand in the government railway department on a two-year credit and at a price fixed by a board of appraisers. In spite of the fact that this solution did not work out as well as expected, there can be no doubt that this government action was

[52] The operation of this road, which ran up to the most advanced line, was the closest parallel to the operation of railroads in the recent war.

[53] *Rebellion records*, series 3, vol. 3, p. 910; *ibid.*, series 1, vol. 31, part 1, p. 728.

[54] *Ibid.*, series 3, vol. 5, p. 1004.

[55] Carl R. Fish, *The restoration of the southern railroads* (Madison, 1919), gives an excellent account of the return of these roads.

[56] *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 1 session, no. 155, pp. 417, 418.

the only thing that saved the southern railroads from complete ruin in 1865.

Very unfortunately, the appraised prices of stock were estimated at a time when prices were at their highest point, and, accordingly, when the two-year credit period was over a great many of the southern railroads found themselves unable to pay and felt aggrieved at the abnormally high prices that they had been charged. Added to this condition were the facts that some of the articles had been obviously overvalued and that several of the people in charge had given the railroads to understand that no payment would ever be insisted upon.[57] These factors eventually induced congress to lessen the amount of the debts incurred,[58] and in some cases even this reduced amount was never paid.

Looked at from any point of view, the government operation of southern railroads during the civil war is an interesting study. In a military way it furnished an object lesson which the world has never forgotten; from an administrative point of view the gradual growth and unification of the department is a nice bit of constitutional history; and from a practical point of view the results accomplished were highly creditable to all concerned. By the end of the war McCallum had built up an organization that was administratively sound and able to perform feats of railroad building before considered impossible. The *American railroad journal* says that "one of the most extraordinary examples of the skill of our American Railway Engineers was given recently in the construction of the Orange and Alexandria Railroad. . . . The Atlantic and Great Western Engineers . . . and those of the Union Pacific Eastern Division . . . must acknowledge themselves second to Col. McCallum and Mr. Anderson."[59] Undoubtedly the results achieved were partly due to Secretary of War Stanton, but the man

[57] For testimony of representatives of the southern railroads and of United States officials on this point, see *House reports*, 39 congress, 2 session, no. 34; *ibid.*, 45 congress, 2 session, no. 909; *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 1 session, no. 155; *ibid.*, 40 congress, 2 session, no. 73; *Senate executive documents*, 44 congress, 1 session, no. 57.

[58] United States, *Statutes at large*, 16: 473; 18: 335; 19: 402.

[59] *American railroad journal*, 17: 1170. The Anderson referred to here is not the J. B. Anderson who was mentioned on page 129, *ante*.

whose administrative ability was chiefly responsible for the work was Daniel C. McCallum.[60]

R. E. Riegel

University of Wisconsin
Madison

[60] For contemporary estimates of McCallum, see Thomas to Grant, in *Rebellion records*, series 1, vol. 32, part 2, p. 89; J. L. Donaldson to Meigs, *ibid.*, vol. 38, part 4, p. 10; report of Chief Quartermaster Ingalls, *ibid.*, vol. 29, part 1, p. 227; Haupt, *Reminiscences*, 312; report of Quartermaster Meigs, in *House executive documents*, 39 congress, 1 session, no. 1, vol. 3, part 1, p. 105; report of Brigadier General L. B. Parsons, *ibid.*, p. 227.

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Nathaniel Lyon Letter

A letter written by Nathaniel Lyon in his characteristically vigorous and unrestrained manner and describing the situation at the St. Louis arsenal in the critical days of early 1861 is given below.[1] Captain Lyon had been ordered from Fort Riley to St. Louis when it became clear from the strategic position of the arsenal that the secessionists were planning to capture it. The arsenal, situated in the southern part of the city and bordering the Mississippi river, was surrounded by a high stone wall except on the water front. Within it in the early part of 1861 were stored large quantities of guns and ammunition — the special need of the secessionists.

That the arsenal was not captured early in the year by the secessionists was due largely to their confidence in the southern sympathies of its commander, Major Bell. A letter of January 24 from General Frost of Camp Jackson to Governor Jackson, both of whom had disunion proclivities, relates a visit to Bell, who "promised me, upon the honor of an officer and a gentleman, that he would not suffer any arms to be removed from the place without first giving me timely information."[2]

On the same day that Frost intimated to the governor that the arsenal would be turned over to the secessionists whenever they desired it, a telegram was sent from Washington to the *New York Evening Post* stating that General Scott had information of a plot for the seizure of the St. Louis arsenal. The news of this plot seems to have been communicated to Washington by Frank P. Blair, leader of the unionists in St. Louis, whose re-

[1] The original of this letter is in the possession of the Minnesota historical society. Nathaniel Lyon was born on July 14, 1818, at Ashford, Connecticut. He was graduated at West Point in 1841, became a captain during the Mexican war, and served with distinction against the Indians in California. In 1854 he was sent to Fort Riley and there he espoused the cause of the free soil party. He was made brigadier general and was put in command of the department of the west in May, 1861. He was killed in the battle of Wilson's Creek on August 10, 1861.

[2] James Peckham, *Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, and Missouri in 1861. A monograph of the great rebellion* (New York, 1866), 44.

peated representations of conditions at the arsenal resulted late in January in the order for Lieutenant T. W. Sweeney, of the Second infantry, then in New York, to report to Major McRae at Jefferson Barracks, just outside St. Louis, and for Major Bell to be transferred to the eastern department. Bell, having large financial interests in St. Louis, resigned and Major Hagner took command at the arsenal.

The removal of Bell, the appointment of Major Hagner to command the arsenal, and the order for Captain Sweeney to relieve Lieutenant Thompson in command of the troops at the arsenal made the secessionists realize their mistake in delaying so long. To add to their discomfiture, Captain Lyon, of known pro-union and violent antislavery sentiments, arrived early in February. Secret plans for the capture of the arsenal were laid immediately.

Lyon with his radical nature could not fail to suspect the more cautious and conservative Hagner. Moreover, Hagner had been assigned his post at the arsenal because of his brevet rank. Lyon's commission as captain was twenty days older than Hagner's and on the strength of this fact Lyon at once asserted his right to the command, despite Hagner's brevet majority. The matter was referred to General Harney, in command of the western department, and subsequently to the president, both of whom sustained Hagner. It is the sense of injustice rankling in his breast which prompts Lyon to speak in the letter of the "outrage done me and the line of the Army." The dispassionate reader, however, is not so easily convinced that Lyon was wholly in the right.

Lyon at once allied himself with the abolitionist and unionist groups of the city, and with Blair and others helped to raise volunteer companies. His time was full of drills and discipline of the home guards, on whom he felt he might be compelled to rely for the safety of the arsenal.

Meantime it was decided that a state convention should make the momentous choice between union and secession. Contrary to all expectation, when it met in Jefferson City on February 28 there was not one avowed secessionist among the members. After organizing, it adjourned to meet in St. Louis on March 4. Here many questions were touched upon and resolutions were referred to a committee on federal relations, dealing with such

topics as support of the union, denunciation of a coercive policy of the government toward the seceding states, the withdrawal of federal troops from forts in the seceded states, and a border states policy.

On March 4 a riot threatened to precipitate the clash for which the secessionists were striving as an opportunity for seizing the arsenal. A nondescript flag, purporting to be the emblem of the confederacy, was hoisted during the previous night over the headquarters of the Minute Men, a secessionist organization, in the very face of the convention which was assembling. A mob gathered outside and for some time it seemed as though a bloody encounter were inevitable. Blair and the republican leaders managed to keep their followers quiet, however, and toward midnight the crowd dispersed.

Such were the conditions under which the following letter was penned. Who "Dr Scott" was it is hard to say. On the card attached to the letter the name is given as "David Scott," but no authority is given for the Christian name, and the card obviously was made years after the receipt of the letter by the Minnesota historical society. It is even uncertain whether the "Dr" is merely an abbreviation for "Dear," or whether Scott was a doctor.

The interest of the letter is twofold. Besides giving a picture of Missouri and St. Louis in the early months of 1861 and some conception of life in the military circles of the day, it reveals in all his sterling ruggedness and unlovely intolerance a man whose type was so incomprehensible to the south. Nathaniel Lyon believed that silence gives consent; hence he spoke his mind unreservedly whenever his puritan conscience bade him condemn the matter under consideration. Such men were pillars of strength in the strife that followed, but they also made it unnecessarily bitter. One might even say that but for them it need not have been.

GRACE LEE NUTE

St Louis Arsenal,
March 7, 1861,

Dr Scott,

Your note of the 2d Inst was received last evening & I am much obliged for your kind attention.

I go up to Town often and have just returned — I always find myself busy there and have to hurry back to attend drills &c. I met Mr McIn-

tyre & Miss Atkinson some days ago there, but have not been down to call on them — went down & spent one day at the Barracks with Robinson & wife and Family of Maj Macrae — have met Mrs. Wilson & her daughter Mrs Thompson — Thompson was here on duty but has gone to Leavenworth — shall call on these Ladies soon. Capt Steele of the Drag's is in Town, having been deprived of his command at Leavenworth by old Scott,[3] with his characteristic tyranny — he feels badly. I saw O'Connell in Town to day, but did not give him McLean's message,[4] I will do so soon, he is often down here — please thank McLean for his kind sentiments and efforts — I get very mad in thinking over the villainy of old Scott's character, and the outrage done me and the line of the Army — I have expected the necessity for a correction of this would force the new administration to do it — I cannot say that it will, as Lincoln seems to have put himself in this man's hands. I should not fret myself so much if Hagner had any capacity for command, and zeal for the Service, but his persistent refusal to take any precautions for defence, and his orders that we are not to repel an attacking force till he has taken possession of our walls, and securely lodged himself behind them, and so entered our grounds that we are measurably in the enemy's power, convince me of covert treachery or unaccountable imbecility. In case of an attack, I suspect we shall have traitors inside as well as outside, and you may rely upon it, so far as in my power, both will be dealt with as effectually as circumstances will permit — if, as I suspect, old Scott wants this place given up, and ourselves disgraced and our country still further degraded, he had better get me and some others, of the officers now here, out of the place before the attempt is made, — by proper precautions we can hold this place easily with less force than we now have, and though, as it is, I hope we shall hold it, we must do so, if attacked, at great sacrifice. I should like old Scott to know, that I see in this matter confirmatory evidence of what I have always regarded him, as an unqualified scoundrel, and if the present impending danger subsides, I shall do what I can to put this matter in a proper light, & bring it to its legal hearing.

[3] General Winfield Scott, commander of the United States armies. For similar remarks about Scott by Lyon, see a letter stating that "Major Hagner has no right to the Command, and, under the sixty-second article of War, can only have it by a special assignment of the President, which I do not believe has been made; but that the announcement of Gen. Scott that the command belongs to Major Hagner is his own decision, and done in his usual sordid spirit of partisanship and favoritism to pets, and personal associates, and toadies." Peckham, *Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, and Missouri in 1861*, p. 67.

[4] Possibly Judge McLean of the United States supreme court. See James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850* (New York, 1893), 2: 179, and index.

Soon after I arrived here I was able to see that purposes of an attempt on this place were entertained, but the matter subsided, and the secessionists have laid their plans for an extraordinary effort, to be stimulated upon the indignation at Lincoln's inaugural address — at that time a secession flag was raised in the City, and riot threatened, — I cannot say that any purposes were entertained concerning this place. The Convention is in session here, and so far is doing very well, but a popular hobby with the secessionists is, to cry out against coercion, and in connection with this to put the policy of Lincoln, as properly set forth in his address, in such an attitude of coercion as shall appeal to the coercion opposition, and place Mo. in an attitude of hostility to the Gov't, — this policy, or that of determining upon a convention of the border slave states seems likely to succeed. Of course, I like the purpose declared by Mr. Lincoln to hold, occupy and possess public places &c, — let him do this — save poor Anderson [5] & other victims of Buchanan's treachery, with discretion and firmness, and though it may cost us much lead, it is the only way to effect anything, and save us from entire anarchy and destruction. Tell our Republican friends that Maj Anderson should have the Brigadier Generalship — Sumner [6] does not deserve it — he is now as high as he ought to be, and let this signal heroism which is the delight of our countrymen, be duly rewarded, — we cannot do too much for Maj Anderson and his heroic party. I regret to see, this early, a spirit [of] partisan policy that would advance party and personal favorites at the expense of justice and the interests of the service, and this party, from which I had hoped so much, whose advent to power I had so much longed and labored for, at once demoralized by that odious feature of democracy — If Mr Lincoln cannot, upon the avowed purpose of his party, rise above party tricks and sordid aims, we are indeed most miserable, & I can see nothing before us but disaffection in his own party, and general misrule and disaster. I would apply these remarks to the question of this Generalship and other appointments to the Army, in which we are interested, — that case of old W. B. Montgomery,[7] dismissed for his villany at Fort

[5] Major Anderson, in command of Fort Sumter. The question of withdrawing Anderson from Sumter was then agitating the country.

[6] Edwin Vose Sumner, 1797-1863, served in the Black Hawk and Mexican wars, became commander at Fort Leavenworth in 1856, and in 1858 commanded the department of the west. In February, 1861, he had charge of Lincoln's escort from Springfield to Washington. In March he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general and was sent to the Pacific to supersede A. S. Johnston. *The national cyclopaedia of American biography* (New York, 1892-1910), 4: 183.

[7] Colonel W. B. Montgomery while in command at Fort Riley extended the reserve of the fort in order to accommodate Governor Reeder, who could not induce owners of certain tracts of land to sell to him. For this Montgomery was court-

Riley — I presume Mr Lincoln & his party will be favourable to his restoration, — I wish you would speak to such of them as you know, and to Senator Foster of my State,[8] and say that his re-appointment will be a great outrage and that I will, if made, so expose it over my own name. I should like you to inform me if this matter is in contemplation — tell me who of our Kansas people are in Washington — Delahay, Vinaldi, Dr Woodward &c — if any of them, whom I know, are there, say my regards. Do you know Miss Julia Lee[9] daughter of Maj Lee of the Commissary Dep't? — these Julias seem to possess a peculiar charm, & there must be something in the name — please go and see her for me, and say many regards and that I hope she is right on the question of the Union, both national and domestic, but that if opposed to the former, I hope she may never realize the latter, but live an old maid forever — a sorry fate indeed, but less so than that which ultimately awaits secessionists.

If any of my republican friends in Washington can do any thing for you, tell them they have my orders to do it.

I intend going up town and will try and see Oconnell and show him your letter before closing this. Just returned from town but did not see O'Connell — will do so soon and see that he gets yours & McLean's messages. Please say to Maj Hunter[10] that I wrote to him and also inclosed to him a letter for Mr F B Blair in which I pointed out the wants of the service here — please ask the Major if he received them. Sweeney sends you his regards and I remain

Yours truly

N. Lyon

martialed. Lyon was a witness. See Ashbel Woodward, *Life of General Nathaniel Lyon* (Hartford, 1862), 213.

[8] Senator Foster of Connecticut.

[9] Julia Eustis Lee, daughter of Major Richard Bland Lee, 1797-1875. Major Lee was a graduate of West Point and, like Lyon, a veteran of the Seminole and Mexican wars. When Virginia seceded, Lee resigned from the army and was appointed a lieutenant colonel in the commissariat of the confederate service. Julia Lee, like Lyon, never married. This personal touch is all the more interesting as showing a more appealing side of Lyon's character. For a sketch of Richard Bland Lee and his family, see Edmund J. Lee, *Lee of Virginia, 1642-1892. Biographical and genealogical sketches of the descendants of Colonel Richard Lee* (Philadelphia, 1895), 462.

[10] See Peckham, *Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, and Missouri in 1861*, p. 66. It has been thought not worth while to give an account of many of the persons mentioned in the letter. Most of them are to be found in the books already mentioned and in Thomas L. Snead, *The fight for Missouri from the election of Lincoln to the death of Lyon* (New York, 1886); *The last political writings of Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, U.S.A.* (New York, 1861); and Robert J. Rombauer, *The union cause in St. Louis in 1861* (St. Louis, 1909).

An Important Swedish Source

A two-volume work, *Minnen från en sjuttonärig vistelse i Nordvestra Amerika*, af Gustaf Unonius (Upsala, 1861, 1862), totaling 1,045 pages and recording the experiences and observations of a Swedish immigrant during a residence of seventeen years in the Mississippi valley deserves some mention, however belated, in a periodical devoted to the history of the Mississippi valley.

The life story of Gustaf Unonius is not typical of that of the average Swedish immigrant, but he was unusually well qualified by training and experience to undertake the task of weaving into the history of the west from 1841 to 1858 the story of individual pioneers, native and foreign born, and the founding and development of settlements, as well as his own remarkable career as a pioneer farmer and "circuit riding" minister in the service of the Protestant Episcopal church.

The story begins with the meditations of a nineteen-year-old student at Upsala university, whose empty pocketbook and prospective bride turn his thoughts toward America — its rich soil, its industrial progress, its respect for labor however menial, its contempt for the conventional, and its sound political system — which at the opening of the decade of the forties was beckoning to the millions of Europe whose fairest hopes were blighted in the land of their birth. The ambitious student was among the very first of the subjects of the Swedish king to avail himself of the lately granted privilege of leaving the realm without the special permission of His Majesty.

For the convenience of the reviewer Unonius' "Reminiscences" may be divided into three parts. The first deals with the voyage across the Atlantic, the sojourn in a New York boarding house, where he was known as "Mr. Unonius of Switzerland," and the journey to Milwaukee, Wisconsin territory, via the Hudson river, the Erie canal, and the Great lakes. The second records in detail the location of a preëmption claim at Pine lake, Wisconsin, on land granted by congress to a defunct canal company — the possession of which was assured by a claim association until such time as the land should revert to the government — the building of a cabin, and the clearing and cultivation of the

land. The third, comprising the entire second volume (621 pages), centers around the activities of a student in the Episcopal theological seminary at Nashotah, Wisconsin, and of an ordained minister in organizing congregations in Scandinavian settlements and ministering to the spiritual needs of his countrymen throughout the Mississippi valley. In common with most "travelers" of the time, Unonius decorated his pages with discourses, more or less accurate, on the Indians and the early history of the country. Naturally, these pages are of little or no value to the present-day historian, but no doubt they were interesting to readers in Sweden. Unlike most travelers, whose glittering generalizations about things American contain more poetry than truth, Unonius wrote from a wealth of experience and with the discriminating mind of the scholar. He was by no means blind to the limitations and shortcomings of Americans and their country, but he was tremendously impressed with the greatness of the land and ardently praised the essential qualities of the pioneer. Except when defending himself against the acrimonious criticism of Swedish and Norwegian Lutheran ministers, who regarded his affiliation with the Episcopal church as little short of treason to the church of his native land, he writes without perceptible conscious or unconscious prejudice.

He found the American greedy for money, but it was not the pinch-penny stinginess of the German-American pioneer. The American spurns the idea of growing rich dollar by dollar; the German, on the other hand, measures his wealth in pennies. He visited a German settlement in Wisconsin where a considerable number of farmers made a good living on twenty-acre farms. The German, he writes, understands better than the American how to make every inch of ground count, and with it is willing to make sacrifices unbearable to the latter. He found the generosity of Americans without equal in any land. The unstinted response to the cry for succor from the miserable Swedish immigrants during the ravages of the cholera caused him to set down the following: "I doubt whether in any other land under similar circumstances assistance would have been so prompt, so spontaneous, so generous; and it is not to be wondered at, that with such memories from my stay in that country I love and admire a people, which, with all its faults, possesses in its heart treasures as rich as the ground it treads." Raised to manhood

in a land where the "continental" Sabbath was in vogue, Unonius could not join the chorus of criticism of the puritanical Sabbath from the German and Irish immigrants. Contrary to opinion in Sweden, he found a profound respect for the Christian religion and its ministers among men of all shades of opinion and profession and vocation. Of the transformation in the naturalized American and the second generation American he could not always write in glowing terms. The immigrant leaves behind him so many sacred ties, he writes, that it is often difficult to touch a heart cord responsive to higher and nobler things. With the accumulation of wealth he becomes haughty and tries to cast aside every suggestion of his former circumstances. He affects the less attractive traits of the Americans. In a land of religious freedom he turns his back on religious observances and customs as remnants of the old world. At first the Scandinavian immigrants, accustomed to servile positions in their native lands, are meek and servile, but, having tasted of republican freedom and equality, they become impolite and impertinent. The man who on a certain occasion was with difficulty persuaded to wear his hat when conversing with Unonius on the street, he writes, a few days later insisted on wearing it when he called on him in his home.

In spite of urgent appeals from politicians, especially those of democratic persuasion, Unonius was tardy in applying for citizenship in the great republic. He felt himself too poorly informed about American conditions to take active part in politics. He was not concerned about the election of justices of the peace, constables, and supervisors. "We were protected in person and property," he writes, "and had every reason to be satisfied with the government; in fact we were hardly conscious of the existence of a government." He regarded the desire of immigrants to mix in politics as soon as they were legally qualified as a great evil, and he was certain that it would sooner or later become necessary to alter the naturalization law. The Germans and especially the Irish, he writes, have scarcely had time to put a roof over their heads before they take a lively part in all political questions.

> I love the social order of a democracy, in which the people's majesty is truly a majesty in the presence of which one may have greater reverence than before a king's throne; and I believe that some day the American

people, left to themselves, will reveal to the world this reverence. But when one sees European immigrants don the toga of democracy, which on their shoulders is usually transformed into a fool's cloak; when one hears them speak of freedom and with a dictatorial mien pass judgment on public questions of great importance, of which the bulk of them know almost nothing, but are mere tools in the hands of politicians — then one can scarcely repress a smirk at the contemplation of what sort of republic the countries of Europe will find workable in the event that the modern apostles of freedom in those countries succeed in getting their principles adopted. Democracy in Europe will prove to be something different from American democracy.

Unonius gives an excellent description of the practical working of pioneer democracy in the meeting of the claim association of which he was a member. The occasion for the meeting was the purchase from the canal company of an eighty-acre tract, which had been "claimed" by an immigrant and duly registered with the claim association.

The result of this action and the consequent dispute was the calling of all the pioneers in the township to a mass meeting to be held in the school house. Practically all the Swedes, including myself, were on hand at the appointed time. The meeting was well attended, and in the weather-beaten faces of the backwoodsmen could be detected an expression of anger and determination which clearly indicated that they had already come to a decision which boded little good for the offender. Others, apparently more composed, sat as close as possible to the redhot stove, which radiated a stifling heat mingled with the odor of burning leather in the small, low room. It is the practice of some Americans in cold weather to extend their feet almost into the fire. It is a common thing upon entering a public house to see a group of men sitting huddled together with their feet resting on the stove. The snow under the soles of their boots melts and sizzles on the hot iron and from the scorched boots ascend columns of smoke which blend in a sweet odor — if for no one else, at least for the cobbler. As usual, jack-knives were in evidence. . . In the hands of a deft whittler a stick of wood takes on various forms, — a cone, square, and pyramid, or some other mathematical figure, — until within a few minutes the stick is transformed into chips. It must not be thought that this is an aimless pastime. Often rather profound thoughts revolve in the whittler's mind, and just at the moment one may conclude that his mind is concerned only with the stick and knife, it is perhaps occupied with some lucrative speculation. . .

On this occasion the broad blades of various sizes seemed to be exposed

rather for the purpose of stabbing an opponent than for whittling. With more than usual violence the chips flew from one bench to another; there was something threatening in the motion of the hand, and the gleaming knifeblade, like the glance of the whittler, reflected the lynch law's already pronounced judgment.

After a time the meeting came to order. Mr. S. was nominated chairman. Mr. S. was a prosperous but, like most of those present, uneducated farmer, one of the oldest settlers in the community, influential and highly respected, who had recently been elected justice of the peace. Mr. S. took the chair behind the schoolmaster's desk at one end of the room, expressed his thanks for the honor bestowed upon him, and called for the election of a secretary. A gentleman arose and nominated Mr. Unonius *to the secretary of the meeting*; but Mr. U. begged to be excused on the ground that he was unfamiliar with the duties of the secretary of a meeting of this nature. Another was nominated and elected. Everything proceeded according to parliamentary rules. The chairman declared the meeting regularly organized, explained briefly the purpose of the meeting, and invited discussion.

A tall, rawboned farmer, a typical backwoodsman, arose. In the swarthy, deep-lined face could be read the story of a constant, though voluntary, struggle with nature, a power seasoned by many years of toil and privation, a presence of mind and determination testifying to ever present danger from the wild beasts and men of the prairie and forest. In short, in the man's form and appearance was recorded the history of the frontier. His dress was partly that of the white man and partly that of the red man. A red flannel hunting shirt encircled by a wide leather belt was visible under a loose tunic of blue felt, extending to his knees and cut so that the wide black borders had the appearance of a hem or trimming at the bottom and about the neck. His feet were clad in buckskin moccasins, and the close-fitting leggings were of the same material. In his hand he held a long rifle, which must have seen service and furnished companionship during an adventurous and eventful career.

Having addressed the chairman and meeting with the customary *Mr. president and gentlemen*, with a native eloquence he explained in a clear and connected speech the facts with reference to the so-called canal land. He attempted to show that the canal company had secured the land grant through fraud, and, having failed to carry out its part of the agreement thus far, clearly showed that it had no intention of doing so; that the claim-jumper had paid a higher price for the land than the law demanded, in expectation of large returns; that it was nothing short of rascality for the government to ask a higher price for this land than for any other; that the people had the undoubted right to oppose such proceedure; that

it was unjust to allow this land to remain unclaimed and uncultivated when with each day groups of people, a *respectable class of native citizens and foreigners*, arrived to establish homes, and to make within a few years this *glorious territory to one of the greatest and most important states in the union.* He insisted upon the moral and legal right of every bona fide settler to his claim, and stigmatized as *the greatest act of rascality* imaginable the secret purchase of such a claim. He expressed the hope that the community would act as one man in the case in question in meting out justice, in order to protect them in the future from similar outrages.

His speech was punctuated with typical western expressions and the stock phrases of the American platform, as, for instance, 'It is the duty of every citizen to guard the sacred freedom for which our forefathers fought, and to protect each other in the enjoyment thereof,' etc.

The chairman submitted to the meeting if it was not in order before adopting any resolution to establish beyond a doubt the guilt of the man accused of having jumped the claim. One after another, witnesses for the plaintiff arose and stated the facts pertinent to the case. Not one arose in behalf of the defendant, unless one recognizes his defenders in the person of the chairman and others who in a spirit of perfect fairness asked questions to have the matter cleared up and the charge proved. The result of the investigation was to declare the defendant guilty, and now arose the question of his punishment.

An Irishman, a typical paddy, in ragged and dirty clothes, who sat in a corner, constantly sliding from one side of the bench to the other and giving expression to an intermittent groaning 'uff' to notify the meeting that he was primed with a speech, secured the floor. With the attitude of a man ready for a fist fight on the spot, he unburdened his mind in the manner and brogue characteristic of the sons of beautiful Erin. He saw a great danger to his beloved adopted land and its free institutions if offenses like the one in question were not severely punished, and for his part demanded that the offender be tarred and feathered and his house burned, adding that he *would be damned* if he would not assist in carrying out the penalty.

A number were of the opinion that the punishment suggested by the worthy gentleman was rather harsh; but the motion to set fire to the house was almost unanimously favored, and there is no telling what the consequences would have been, if my countryman Petterson in his usual calm and earnest manner had not asked for the floor and made another motion.

Seeing that feeling was running high, in order to avert an act of violence, the consequences of which might have been serious, he proposed a

punishment, which, while severe and effective, could not be called an act of violence and would not make the executors liable under the law. His motion was to the effect that the offender should be placed under an interdict: that nobody should have anything to do with him, neither speak to him nor visit him. If he came to anybody's door, he should be turned away with disdain. Nothing should be sold to him nor bought from him. In short, the excommunicated man should be shunned and despised by all until he had made up for his offence and surrendered to the wronged claim-holder the land which rightfully belonged to him. The plaintiff on his part should pay the claim-jumper the legal price for the land when the dispute over the canal land was settled.

This motion won a respectful hearing. There was something entirely new and unusual about it. The punishment could be published in the newspapers as a warning to all *claim-jumpers*. It would lend *respectability* to the entire community. Petterson was complimented as an extraordinarily clever, just, and prudent lynch-law attorney. Naturally this proposition was not to the taste of the Irishman and his followers. Fire seemed to have a special attraction for their highly inflammable dispositions; and a tar and feather party would no doubt have been as interesting to them as a bull fight to Spaniards. But this time the spectacle was denied them. Petterson's motion was set down in the minutes as unanimously adopted, with the amendment, however, that whoever failed to live up to the common understanding in the strictest construction should suffer the same punishment.

The effect of the execution of the sentence was that the offending party soon found it expedient to recompense the injured party for the loss he had suffered.

George M. Stephenson

The following communication from Mr. J. P. Dunn speaks for itself. Cannot the association take some action? C. W. A.

At the recent dedication of the Washington monument at Princeton, President Harding is reported as saying: "I like this monument. I like every monument to the American enterprises of our history. I hope our country will cherish them all to its heart and soul, these great inheritances of ours, whose memory shall help us carry on to the fulfillment of the great American destiny."

If he really meant this — and we may reasonably assume that he did — this should be an opportune season for us of the Mississippi valley to urge the publication by the government of the United States of our historical material that it is holding in

manuscript. This would have been done long ago if the people of this region had known what material is to be had. Unquestionably, historical writers and historical students of the great central states have spent almost countless hours puzzling over questions the answers of which are to be found in the national archives at Washington and nowhere else.

The simple fact which has not been realized is that during the territorial period of every state its seat of government is Washington and the official correspondence is usually preserved there. It is impossible to write the early history of any western state without access to this material; and it ought to be accessible to anybody. The papers relating to the colonial period have been published quite fully, and that has benefited the newer states as well as the original thirteen, for it is the common history of all. But there are thirty-five states whose early history is still locked up in Washington offices. They are paying enough national taxes to demand some consideration; and they have enough representatives in Washington to enforce the demand, if their congressmen are made to understand that their constituents really want this material put into print.

The best available description of this material, at present, is David W. Parker, *Calendar of papers in Washington archives relating to the territories of the United States (to 1873),* (Washington, 1911). This is not complete, but it lists over nine thousand titles in its four hundred and fifty pages. Another comprehensive view of the material is found in Claude H. Van Tyne and Waldo G. Leland, *Guide to the archives of the government of the United States in Washington* (Washington, 1907). Both of these are publications of the Carnegie institution of Washington and should be found in any good library. But all these can do is to furnish an idea of what is accessible. It is impossible to get an adequate idea of the contents of any document from a two-line description of it.

At the present time these documents are said to be accessible to students; but that means that the student must go to Washington and comply with the regulations, one of the most annoying of which is that he can work only during office hours, as, very properly, it is not permissible to take the documents out. Hence

he is shut off from night work entirely. Of course there are many persons interested in historical research who cannot afford the time or the money necessary for a trip to Washington and a stay there. If the student writes for a copy of any document, he must take his chances of its being something he wants, and must pay for the copying.

Active historical workers ought to realize what obstacles these are to the general development of historical interest. There are hundreds of men and women who would enjoy excursions into the history of their localities but who cannot make a business of it. The material must be brought within their reach if they are to do anything with it. There is no reason whatever why the few thousand dollars needed for the publication of this material should not be appropriated. It is merely a matter of making our congressmen understand that the people, or a very respectable portion of them, want this done.

Why should not the historical societies of the western states go after this systematically? If each state society would try to interest the representatives and senators from its state, and also get the local societies to appeal to these same men, it would be very easy to get a majority in both houses in favor of the appropriation. No sane congressman could have any possible objection to it except the expense; and that would not bother him for a minute if he knew there was any material demand for it from his constituents. "Ask, and ye shall receive" is not always a reliable rule in such matters, but it is quite certain that if you do not ask you will not receive. There is no other work that the western societies could engage in that would be more profitable. Shall we move? What do you say?

If the historical interests of the west should make this effort to secure common justice for this region, would it not be rational, at the same time, to urge the establishment of a department, or bureau, of archives, with an archives building? Many people and associations have been making unsuccessful efforts to secure this for some time; and it might be worth while to call attention to all the absurdities of our present system, if we hope to get it reformed. It is quite certain that no other civilized government on earth keeps its historical records in the absurd, haphazard

way that we do, scattered through numerous offices and in the way in all of them. There are few departments in Washington that do not need the space occupied by old records for up-to-date work. Why not take Hamlet's advice to the players and "reform it altogether"?

J. P. Dunn

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

The maritime history of Massachusetts, 1783-1860. By Samuel Eliot Morison. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1921. 400 p. $5.00)

This is a book of extraordinary quality. It is sound history, built upon a wealth of material, as the bibliography shows, and the evidence is well handled. The story is told in good style, picturesque and pleasing, and shows that sound history need not be dull reading as is so often the case in these days. It is full of human interest, giving full play to the personal and social forces operating in the maritime life of coastal Massachusetts. There are fine pen portraits of the doughty sea captains and the vigorous merchant princes of the time. There are chapters telling of ships and seamen, of merchants and their mansions, of society in Boston, Salem, Marblehead, Nantucket, and a score of maritime towns. Here we learn not only of the many famous ships by name, but also of shipbuilding and the shipbuilders. Here we are told of the Pacific northwest trade, of the sailing of the southern seas, of the Canton trade of Boston, of the India trade of Salem, of markets in the Baltic and the Mediterranean. Here is related the rise and fall of the fishing industry of Marblehead, Beverly, Gloucester, and Cape Cod, and the whaling industry of Nantucket and New Bedford. The profits of voyages, the wages of sailors, the methods of business, the merchandise of great variety exported and imported, are fully set forth. The book is full of romance, of color, of atmosphere; it is redolent of salt air and tar; it has a bit of verse here and a curious tale there that enlighten and amuse. The book is enlivened with threescore well-chosen illustrations of famous ships and sea captains, of great merchants, and of types of ships.

In addition to all these excellences, the work is a fine study in the relations of man and nature. With all its wealth of coast line, Massachusetts was inferior to other states in harbors, in great rivers leading inland, in great staple products. In spite of this inferiority, Massachusetts enjoyed a maritime supremacy until the civil war. "Man and a rugged faith made her what she is." It is also a splendid study in the relations of economics and politics. Here we see the political dominance of the maritime section in the ratification of the first state constitution

and the federal constitution of 1789, its superior influence in the councils of the federalist régime of Washington and Hamilton, and its opposition to "Mr. Madison's war."

The reviewer congratulates Mr. Morison. Students of the period may deem themselves fortunate in having so important a subject presented so comprehensively, soundly, and ably.

W. T. Root

Roosevelt in the Bad Lands. By Hermann Hagedorn. [Publications of the Roosevelt memorial association] (Boston: Houghton Mifflin company, 1921. 491 p. $5.00)

All who are interested in the frontier history of the United States and especially those who admire Theodore Roosevelt will welcome this volume. The ranching frontier of the late eighties was made real to readers by Roosevelt in "Cowboy land" of his *Autobiography*; in "Hunting trips of a ranchman"; in "Ranch life and the hunting trail"; and in "The wilderness hunter." Very faithfully the author of the present volume supplements these vivid portrayals by giving sketches drawn from interviews with the men who were the associates of Roosevelt on the ranch and on hunting expeditions and who seconded his efforts as a leader of the forces of law and order in a community "made up of a heterogeneous aggregation of desperate men."

Roosevelt himself made the volume possible through his letters of introduction to these men which were written for the author early in 1918. "If you want to know what I was like when I had bark on," he said, "you ought to talk to Bill Sewall, and Merrifield and Sylvane Ferris and his brother Joe." Inspired by these letters of their former partner, Merrifield and Sylvanus Ferris from "their old stamping-ground along the little Missouri, unfolded, bit by bit, the story of the four years of Roosevelt's active ranching life. In the deserted barroom of the old Metropolitan hotel at Medora (rechristened the "Rough Riders") on the ruins of the Maltese Cross cabin and under the murmuring cottonwoods at Elkhorn, they spun their joyous yarns. Apart from what they had to tell, it was worth traveling two-thirds across the continent to know these figures of an heroic age." Joe Ferris, Mrs. Margaret Roberts, John Reuter (Dutch Wannigan), Dr. Victor H. Stickney, John Willis, who was Roosevelt's companion on hunting expeditions, and many more men of the west were interviewed. Among others who contributed to the narrative were William Sewall of Island Falls, Maine, foreman of the ranch at Elkhorn, Lincoln Lang of Philadelphia, and A. T. Packard of Chicago, editor of the *Bad Lands cowboy*. Besides these personal interviews, the chief source of the author, he had access also to certain unpublished letters in the possession of Roosevelt's sisters and of Henry

Cabot Lodge and he has made use of the files of the northwestern newspapers of the period.

The Bureau of Roosevelt research and information established by the Roosevelt memorial association has made a genuine contribution, through the labors of Mr. Hagedorn, toward the goal of gathering all available biographical data concerning Theodore Roosevelt. There are no dull pages and the volume is well illustrated.

J. A. J.

E. H. Harriman. A biography. By George Kennan. 2 volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1922. 421, 421 p.)

There are few men whose work lay in the latter part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries who more deserve an adequate delineation than does E. H. Harriman. Whether he be viewed as an ogre of high finance, bent upon gathering railroad after railroad into his insatiable maw, or as a constructive builder who contributed much to the material development of the regions where his interests lay, he has to be reckoned with as one of the potent forces of a pregnant era of American industrial life. One links as a matter of course the names of Harriman and Hill, not only because each was a giant in the annals of transportation but on account of the manner in which their paths occasionally crossed and the contests which ensued. Some years ago Mr. Pyle added to the biographical and historical literature of recent years by writing his *Life* of Mr. Hill; and now Mr. Kennan brings out that of Harriman to place beside it.

Mr. Kennan wisely has not attempted to write a chronology. After a chapter in which the "Ancestry, boyhood and early life" of Harriman receive brief but adequate attention, continuing activities which stretch over the greater part of the railroad man's life are gathered up in consecutive accounts. So, for example, the chapter on "The boys' club," tells of Harriman's early interest and long devotion to an organization in New York which has played a notable part in the history of philanthropic work of that city.

It is with Harriman's connection with railroads, however, that one expects and finds the more detailed and, on the whole, satisfying work. His experiences as a broker, his gradually rising interest in transportation, and his final absorption in the problems of that field, financial and other, are traced from his first step when he became associated with the Ogdensburg and Lake Champlain railroad company, through his entrance into the affairs of the Illinois Central, which led inevitably to the Union Pacific. The chapter on the "Reconstruction and reëquipment of the Union Pacific" brings out what Mr. Kennan believes was always an outstanding characteristic of Harriman's railroad operations,

that of making the properties with which he was associated models of up-to-date, efficient, public-serving transportation systems; and one is forced to conclude that Mr. Kennan comes near to proving his case. The policy of refusing to pay dividends out of what should go into the roads, into rolling stock, into the elimination of gradients and curves, remained a cardinal point in the management of every road which came to be a part of the Harriman system. After the acquisition of the Southern Pacific, in order to secure control of the Central Pacific and a direct outlet for the Union Pacific to the west, some $240,000,000 were spent in betterments of all sorts, including about $9,000,000 for the Lucin cut-off across Great Salt lake. All told, the improvements on Harriman's Pacific roads cost about $400,000,000.

The direct public aid which was given by the Pacific roads in saving the oasis in the Imperial valley from being turned into a lake by the pouring of the waters of the Colorado into the Salton basin, as well as the aid given at the time of the San Francisco fire, was primarily the work of E. H. Harriman, and again demonstrates that the man was something more than a master of high finance engaged in amassing millions through his manipulations.

Some biographers achieve the distinction of writing of their subjects with sympathy while avoiding partisanship. More works like Croly's *Marcus Alonzo Hanna* are devoutly to be desired. But just as Mr. Pyle was inclined to exalt Hill into a demigod so Mr. Kennan sometimes loses his perspective with Harriman. It is unquestionably proper and fair to attempt to banish the idea which was associated with Harriman's name in the early years of this century; but it is not needful to try to show that criticism of acts and methods in all cases is unjust. While Mr. Kennan undoubtedly does service in reëxplaining his subject's relation to a matter like the Chicago and Alton affair, or to the Union Pacific dividend of 1906, it is equally true that he goes too far when he tries to invest his hero with a robe and a halo. It is apparent that Harriman played the game with the cards in use, that on the whole he played a fair game according to the accepted rules. But, as in the case of the Chicago and Alton, there may be legitimate difference of opinion on the point of the reorganization: while the conclusions of Professor Ripley, which are severely condemned by Mr. Kennan, may be unjust to Harriman, on the other hand there seems to be a case of protesting too much.

There is an interesting chapter, or rather two of them, on the falling-out between Harriman and Roosevelt. On the whole, Mr. Kennan's account seems to leave the next move to the biographers of the former president in order that they may explain the so-far unexplained change of attitude whereby Harriman suddenly became a typical "malefactor of

great wealth'' instead of a trusted acquaintance, perhaps a rather close friend.

Taken all in all, Mr. Kennan's work is a distinct contribution, and a readable one as well. The maintenance of a certain personal detachment throughout would have added something of value; as it is, the reader must take the story from different presentations and must form his own conclusions.

Chapters on the history of the Southern Pacific. By Stuart Daggett. (New York: The Ronald press, 1922. 470 p.)

Primarily a study in economics, that of the rise of a great railroad system, this book of Mr. Daggett's will be welcomed by all who are interested in problems connected with the history of the United States in the past half century or more. Especially those who believe that some sort of guiding thread is to be found in the economic revolution which has been manifesting itself in this country since the civil war will prize a work which traces with meticulous care the evolution of a transportation unit so interwoven with the destinies of a large section of the west and the southwest.

It is easy to believe the author when he says in his preface that the volume is the result of work which ''has been more or less actively in progress over a period of eight years so that there has been more than usual opportunity for checking, comparison of views, and the testing of material.'' Not content, as no student would be, with the results which would come from consulting the easily accessible reports and secondary accounts, he has delved into a mass of source material composed of official publications, like that of the United States Pacific railway commission, court reports, federal, state, and local records, private letters which have been made available, newspapers by the hundreds, pamphlet literature, and railway reports of all kinds. The result is a readable, clear, and very interesting story of the railroad from the days of its inception to the time when the question of the Southern Pacific's control over the Western Pacific went before the supreme court in 1921. As might be expected, preponderant attention is given to the financial aspects of the career of this railroad. Nevertheless there is an abundance of descriptive matter which makes men like Collis P. Huntington, Leland Stanford, Mark Hopkins, Theodore Dehone Judah, Charles Croker, David D. Colton, and a score of others live and seem like real human beings.

Relatively more attention is paid to the fortunes of the road down to about 1899, and the period after E. H. Harriman entered into control is somewhat summarily sketched. In part this is due undoubtedly to the conscious purpose of the author; furthermore, the type of material

upon which Mr. Daggett relies is more abundant for the earlier period than for the later. The reader, however, regrets that it was not possible to give a treatment equally full in the later period, the interest in which is revived not only by the late opinions of the supreme court but by the newly issued biography of Edward H. Harriman.

The book is equipped with a full and usable index, but there is no collected bibliography, which would have been appreciated. In part this lack is supplied by the copious documentation which substantiates the facts on which the author bases his conclusions, but the loss is felt none the less.

Taken all in all, the book is a distinct contribution to the later period of the history of the United States. Mr. Daggett has also by his book called attention to the relatively unworked field which lies in development of railway transportation of the country. When one contemplates the number of aggregations deserving the name of railway systems which as yet are unstudied in any adequate manner one feels under still deeper obligation to Mr. Daggett for setting the pace and providing a standard for his followers in the field.

L. B. Shippee

The covered wagon. By Emerson Hough. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1922. 379 p. $2.00)

Now and then a writer of fiction takes for the background of his story an historical setting and so succeeds in depicting the spirit of a bygone day that the work deserves attention even in a periodical devoted to more serious productions. Such success is that attained by Mr. Hough in his *Covered wagon.* The plot has its setting in the stirring days of the late forties and brings out admirably the forces which impelled men and women to forsake the older settlements and undertake the wearisome miles which lay between the Missouri and Oregon.

This story deals specifically with the Oregon trail of 1848. While its principal characters, of course, are creatures of the author's brain, many a frontiersman whose name is familiar to those who have followed the tale of western development is brought forward; Kit Carson, Jim Bridger, and others whose careers were none the less romantic because they were real pass before the reader.

As an interpretation of the forces which were at work up and down the Mississippi valley and which entered into the conquest of the lands beyond the mountains there are few writings, in fiction form or otherwise, which equal this presentation. Mr. Hough has used to good purpose the store of information which he has culled by many years of study, and he has the art to make the past live in his tale.

Welfare work in Iowa. By Marcus L. Hansen. (Iowa City: State historical society of Iowa, 1921. 321 p.)

This little volume maintains the uniformly high quality of scholarship characteristic of the publications of the State historical society of Iowa. The subject matter is devoted almost wholly to Camp Dodge, the training camp of the Eighty-eighth division. There are eleven chapters, topically arranged, the first one dealing, historically, with "Welfare organizations and equipment," while the next five deal with the means, methods, and problems of the work, under the titles, social, recreational, religious, athletic, and educational work. These titles are significant of the nature of the work carried on by many and varied organizations, among the most prominent being the Y. M. C. A. There was naturally, at first, considerable overlapping of jurisdiction and consequently some friction, especially in athletics, between the Y. M. C. A. and the Commission on training camp activities, but it was finally adjusted with the former directing the mass athletics and the latter directing the training of athletic teams. Educational work, mainly in charge of the Y. M. C. A., consisted of lecture courses, study classes, and so forth, one of the surprises being that even the rudiments had to be taught.

Of the remaining five chapters, chapter 7, "The transfer to government supervision," deals with the departure of the division for France, when the welfare work was most appreciated, the influenza epidemic, and the armistice and demobilization, when it was most severely tested. The armistice brought "an alarming slump in the morale of the soldiers" (page 148), while demobilization brought to the civilians a new pull-together spirit, revealing, however, a tremendous wastage in receipts (page 153). Chapter 8 gives a glimpse of the improvised hospital for wounded overseas soldiers at Fort Des Moines, where new phases of welfare work necessarily were developed. Chapter 9, "Welfare work in the camp community," presents the problem of keeping Des Moines socially fit for the soldiers. Chapter 10, "Welfare work throughout the state," is the least satisfactory, being somewhat labored and fragmentary.

The final chapter, "The scope of welfare work," gives a critical estimate, showing the essential and fundamental place of welfare work. The daily routine had come to be looked upon, by even the welfare workers, as a sort of monotonous grind of doubtful worth. The author, however, goes to the root of the matter when he says: "The very commonness which led these features to be considered merely as part of the day's program attaches to the whole a larger significance than isolated activities or spasmodic contributions could have commanded. That moving picture performances came with the same regularity as drill, that every day brought with it opportunities for recreation as well as service is

the most important fact that can be included in a book on welfare work'' (page 247).

The author quite accurately gauges the soldier's attitude toward welfare work as a bit resentful of certain phases of it, and in like manner shows the guarded aloofness of the officers; yet soldiers and officers, together with civilians generally, came to regard the work as a source of strength to the men in service. The author has done so well what the preface and the editor's introduction promise that any adverse comment seems almost trifling; yet he has mentioned by name some individuals, while he omits others of equal or of greater importance. The same may be said about certain details, though in the main he has not allowed details to obscure the larger movements. The index omits some names of sufficient importance to be included in the narrative. Again, the author accepts, as a matter of course, the belief that ''Smokes for the soldiers'' (page 252) was a ''popular movement,'' while a little investigation might have revealed its true source and character.

The reviewer, having had many and varied opportunities for observation of the welfare work, can but speak of the volume in highest terms of commendation, for the author has made a notable contribution to our war history on the part of civilians and has fortified his work by drawing upon the various first-hand sources for the facts.

Olynthus B. Clark

The American embargo, 1807-1809. By Walter Wilson Jennings. [University of Iowa studies in the social sciences, volume 8, number 1] (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1921. 242 p.)

In *The American embargo, 1807-1809,* Mr. Walter Wilson Jennings has made a useful and scholarly contribution to the economic history of the United States. His researches have been extensive and fruitful, demonstrating scientifically what earlier writers have taken in part by faith and tradition, that all sections of America, save a few favored localities, suffered greatly from the embargo.

The opening chapters describe the condition of American commerce between 1798 and 1807. The author then proceeds to analyze the embargo and its subsequent legislation, citing contemporary comment. Turning to European belligerents and their colonies, he finds the embargo injurious. An elaborately documented chapter follows, describing American hostility toward the measure. It would seem to the reviewer that here too uniform a reliance has been placed upon federalist sources; too slight, upon republican. The steps by which opposition finally prevailed are adequately traced. The concluding chapters relating to American manufactures, agriculture, and commerce are original and constructive. The author concludes that the impetus to manufac-

tures was never wholly lost, that agriculture fared far worse, and that commerce was prostrated.

It seems to the reviewer that, important as the book is to economic history, in its very strength lies a weakness, for in concentrating his attention upon the privations and distress of the times, the author narrowly escapes the point of view of a contemporary federalist. And one looks in vain among federalists — save perhaps in the case of the Adamses, father and son, whose federalism was becoming open to question — for a fair recognition that Jefferson had but little choice beyond embargo or war. Therefore, the hardships due to the embargo fail to give the entire picture. The spirit in which Jefferson embarked upon his policy and the loyalty with which many Americans sustained it are also important. For the embargo was Jefferson's grand experiment in the laboratory of world peace; hence his solicitude to give it a trial to the utmost regardless even of its effect upon his own popularity, which Jefferson viewed as the dearest prize of a long career. But it is possibly unfair to demand an interpretation of the embargo favorable to Jefferson from an author who has chosen to emphasize its material aspects and who has performed his task so thoroughly. *The American embargo, 1807-1809,* is authoritative in its own field and is creditable to its author and to the series in which it appears.

Louis Martin Sears

The age of invention. A chronicle of mechanical conquest. By Holland Thompson. [The chronicles of America. Edited by Allen Johnson under the supervision of the committee on publication of the Yale university council.] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1921. 304 p. $3.50)

In the brief compass of about two hundred and fifty pages Mr. Thompson has compressed the story of some of the most important inventions of the nineteenth century. He describes in turn the contributions made by Franklin, Whitney, Fulton, Slater, Howe, McCormick, Morse, Sholes, Goodyear, Colt, Henry, Edison, Langley, and Wright to the conquest of the forces of nature. Instead of explaining the mechanical principles of the various inventions, he seeks "to outline the personalities of some of the outstanding American inventors and indicate the significance of their achievements." Although he says nothing new, he has distributed with discrimination his appreciations of the services rendered by the various men and has given an interesting narrative of the struggles and successes of the inventors.

To some of the less well-known inventors, such as Obed Hussey, Mr. Thompson gives full credit and he is just in his treatment of Fulton and Whitney. To Morse, on the other hand, he seems to give overmuch credit,

for he does not mention the prior inventions of Cook in England or of Steinheil in Germany, while the successful experiments of Professor Henry at Princeton some five years before Morse's first patent are only alluded to in another chapter.

A few slips were discovered. The flying shuttle of John Kay in 1738 is described as part of the new spinning machinery (page 35). Two Scotchmen are said to have been employed in 1786 to make spinning machines in Massachusetts (page 85); it would have clarified the narrative to have given their names — Alexander and Robert Barr. The principle of standardization is apparently confused with that of interchangeable parts (page 112). The invention of a "horserake" in 1818 is mentioned (page 122), but no mention is made of the tedder, which was the real horserake. In the bibliography of the steam engine (page 249) Mr. Thompson has forgotten to cite W. H. Brown's valuable *History of the first locomotive in America.*

One of the best features of the book, as indeed of the whole series, is the bibliographical notes, which are fresh and helpful.

E. L. Bogart

The influence of George III on the development of the constitution. By A. Mervyn Davies. (Oxford: Oxford university press, 1921. 84 p.)

This little volume — hardly eighty-four pages, inclusive of all appendixes — was given the Stanhope historical essay prize for 1921 in the University of Oxford. It is an endeavor to interweave George III's attempted system of personal government with the democratic movement in England by showing his relations with his ministers, with parliament, and with the electorate. Compared with corresponding works done by undergraduates of our American universities, it must be placed high as a fairly close study of the prevailing influences within the period. As a scholarly piece of work it must take another rating.

Though he admits that "it was a period of climax because it witnessed the culmination and the decline of the system of government by small family groups of great landowners," the author reverts to the whig traditions, to the whig writers, and blandly asserts, "The chief obstacle . . . was the established authority of responsible ministers, upheld by *party connexions.*" He suavely writes of "the revival of the Tory party" and the "struggle for power" which "occupied the first ten years of George III's reign," of "the famous Chatham experiment," an "attempt to rout out the *party* system and to establish in its stead, government by *divided, incoherent* administrations." The writer apparently forgets that George III gravely and proudly avowed on his deathbed that he had lived and would die a whig. He forgets that the

tories were but an insignificant part of one of the factions; that the whigs were split into liberals, conservatives, and those between; that there was not a clash between two parties, but rather a clash of factions within the parties.

Burke is taken as the authority on the attempt to form a broad-bottom ministry; consequently his eighteenth-century use of the word "party" seems to have been given a twentieth-century interpretation, and his statement that it was an attempt to establish a divided, incoherent administration is about as true as his assertion that it lacked all homogeneity, mutual responsibility, and common acceptance of a leader. It is true that George III preferred to be his own prime minister and personally to direct his cabinet and that he did succeed, even in very minute matters; yet one cannot fail to see the monarch bend as various ministers lent their influence.

One other question arises — that of the development of the cabinet and the disappearance of the inner cabinet, or conciliabulum. As the cabinet diminished in numbers there was less need for a secret group within it and the part played by the famous triumvirate could have been easily handled by the entire cabinet in its concrete form in the late eighties. Yet the question seems to be wherein lay the difference between a conciliabulum, and a few ministers meeting with a natural leader, or the king. As the conciliabulum never had any legal sanction or standing, it is impossible to trace its maneuvers save in the letters and papers of its personnel. Then how can one arbitrarily state that it did or did not exist after such a date as 1783? Or, on the other hand, why say that the outer cabinet ceased to exist and that the conciliabulum became the only cabinet body? It seems very likely that a member or two met with the king, or that some few members of the cabinet of the Fox-North coalition ministry might have met by themselves occasionally, and probably matters continued to be settled, partially, outside the cabinet meetings.

The author has read widely in the secondary materials, yet one cannot but note the whig writers which fill the personnel of his bibliography. He has also read, however, the recent writings on the subject in such publications as the *American* and *English historical reviews*. He has evidently relied upon personal research somewhat, especially in the printed correspondence and papers of contemporaries, as well as some in the "Additional manuscripts," though it seems that a closer search of source material would have altered some of his statements and conclusions.

MALCOLM C. SHURTLEFF

The Spanish borderlands. A chronicle of old Florida and the southwest. By Herbert E. Bolton. [The chronicles of America. Edited by Allen Johnson under the supervision of the committee on publication of the Yale university council.] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1921. 320 p. $5.00)

The Spanish borderlands furnish a fascinating theme, and the author of this book is exceptionally well fitted to describe Spanish activities in the debatable land, for he lived for a score of years in Texas and California and studied these regions intensively in libraries and archives. The volume contains a comprehensive sketch of the expansion of New Spain northward and of the struggle of the Spaniards to maintain and to extend their colonial empire against English, French, and Russians in regions which were finally acquired in large part by the United States. Besides his own writings, the author has utilized works by Bancroft, Lowery, and Winship. The volume is equipped with a brief but useful bibliography which includes the most important published works concerning the subject. It contains a map showing the exploration and settlement of New Spain, 1518-1776, and illustrations of the Spanish régime in Florida, New Mexico, and California. Among these are some fine views of Spanish missions. The frontispiece is a portrait of Juan Bautista de Anza, the founder of San Francisco.

The book is composed of two sections. In the first section brief but comprehensive accounts are given of the explorations of Ponce de León, Ayllon, Narváez, Cabeza de Vaca, Hernando de Soto, Coronado, Cabrillo, and Vizcaíno. The second section describes the Spanish colonization of Florida chiefly through the activities of Menéndez, who planted missions at St. Augustine, and of Franciscans who founded missions along the Atlantic coast. Due attention is accorded to Oñate, who in 1598 left Santa Bárbara, Mexico, to establish settlements in New Mexico and who took possession of that region for the king of Spain. In the description of Spanish activities in Texas, Father Hidalgo, who used the menace of French occupation to stimulate the Spaniards to make settlements there, is brought into prominence. The employment by the Spaniards of French traders to fasten Spain's hold upon the vast province of Louisiana is deftly pointed out. Here, too, are described the enterprises by which Father Kino and Father Salvatierra prepared the way for other pioneers by founding missions in present Arizona and Lower California. In the consideration given to the colonization of upper California emphasis is given to the establishment of a mission at San Francisco by Juan Bautista de Anza.

From the preface one gathers that this illuminating volume had to be abbreviated to bring it within the scope set for the *Chronicles of America.* It is unfortunate that, as the reviewer has reason to believe, certain

portions of the story were omitted altogether. Still it is a concise and authoritative narrative of Spain's activities in borderlands of North America. It also contains charming descriptions of life in those regions during the old régime. The decision of the Yale university press to publish the *Chronicles* in a cheaper edition than the Abraham Lincoln edition will undoubtedly bring this scholarly and interesting work within the reach of a much wider circle of readers.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON

Civilization in the United States. An inquiry by thirty Americans. Edited by Harold E. Stearns. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and company, 1922. 577 p. $5.00)

In this bulky volume thirty American intellectuals and three foreigners have banded together for the purpose of passing judgment upon the essentials of American civilization of the present day. The enterprise is a worthy and significant one and of great interest to every American historian who envisages the history of his country as something more than a story of constitutional and political development. The actual accomplishments of the three and thirty, however, fall far short of their ideal. Instead of a descriptive and critical survey of American social and intellectual life, written in that spirit of sympathy without which no criticism can be just, we have here a series of reflections, supercilious for the most part, upon certain selected phases of American life.

It would be evident even without consulting the biographical sketches in the back of the volume that the outlook of the commentators is essentially that of city-bred people. Indeed, the range of interest and sympathetic insight of the commentators is scarcely greater than that section of American life which would be visible from the roof of a Broadway super-skyscraper. This is apparent, for instance, in the significant omissions from the list of topics selected for treatment. Although "Business" in the sense of corporate industry is given a chapter by itself, the great farm industry is totally ignored. Although industrial labor receives attention, the problems of rural life, the increase in farm tenantry, the spread of coöperative marketing, and the rise of the new agrarianism are passed over. Such topics as prohibition, chautauquas, county fairs, women's clubs, and the *Saturday evening post* with its unparalleled circulation of two and a quarter million subscribers, when mentioned at all, are treated cynically and flippantly. Mr. L. R. Reid is the only one of this group of city critics to admit that "The civilization of America is predominantly the civilization of the small town" (page 286), and his opinion is delivered with a naïve mixture of apology and defiance. The subject of religious influences in American life was omitted by the editor

of the volume because it was "next to impossible to get any one to write on the subject." That "The small town" was dignified with a separate chapter was no doubt due to the missionary labors undertaken during the last few years by Edgar Lee Masters, Sinclair Lewis, and other writers acceptable to the metropolitan *intelligentsia.*

The task of reviewing this coöperative work is not unlike that of reviewing thirty-three different volumes, for each author has compressed within his allotment of pages his own special views of some aspect of American civilization. If these critics share any common attitude toward contemporary American life — and, despite the editor's claims, the reviewer is not certain that they do — this common approach is best expressed in the words of Mr. J. E. Spingarn: "We [*Americans*] are all cocksure but bewildered children in a world we cannot understand. We are all parvenus — parvenus on a new continent, on the fringes of which some have lived a little longer than others, but the whole of which has been encompassed by none of us for more than two or three generations; parvenus in a new world of steam and electricity, wireless and aeroplane, machinery and industry, which none of us has yet been able to subdue to a mould that satisfies our deepest cravings; parvenus in our culture, which still seems like a borrowed garment instead of flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone" (page 106).

A few really notable chapters have found places in the collection. Among these should be mentioned "The law" by Mr. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., "Philosophy" by Mr. H. C. Brown, "Poetry" by Mr. Conrad Aiken, and "Scholarship and criticism" by Mr. J. E. Spingarn. These meet the test of being thoughtful, scholarly, stimulating, and informing critiques of their respective subjects.

Of particular interest to readers of this Review are the discussions of historical scholarship in America. To Mr. H. W. Van Loon was assigned the special task of sitting in judgment on "History;" and it is evident that he wrote with a willing pen but with little information. It is his thesis that history books are viewed with "actual hate" by the general public because of the aridity of the work performed by the cloistered and monkish historians of the modern school, and that these same historians, after making a god of scientific method, stultified themselves by converting history into a branch of chauvinistic apologetics during the world war. Without seeking to determine the measure of truth in these charges, it is evident that the critic has no knowledge of the vast achievements of the modern American historians not only in accumulating and classifying a vast array of facts but also in providing new and arresting explanations of the past of Europe and America. His bibliographical note praises Breasted, Robinson, and Beard as text-

book writers, but that these men performed other and more significant work he does not state save when he calls attention to *The new history*, which he erroneously says was published "last year." Of the epochal work of Turner, Semple, Mahan, McMaster, Andrews, Bolton, Osgood, Alvord, Shepherd, G. B. Adams, Haskins, Lea, Taylor, and a host of others he knows nothing, or at least says nothing.

Other references to history appear elsewhere in the volume. While descanting on "Politics" Mr. H. L. Mencken takes occasion to condemn American historians because they are "bedazzled by the economic interpretation of history" (page 28); and, being a persistent faultfinder, he subsequently condemns them because they have failed to follow up the "valuable suggestions" made in the preface of Beard's *Economic interpretation of the constitution* for a study of political origins (page 532). Most American historians, he finds, "are simply unintelligent schoolteachers." Mr. J. E. Spingarn, on the other hand, in comparing the products of university scholarship in various fields, rates the "historical manual or text-book" highest and the dissertation in literature lowest in the scale. He stresses, however, the incompatibility of teaching responsibilities and the creative spirit requisite for scholarly achievement and expresses the opinion that the chief monuments of American scholarship have seldom if ever come from men whose whole lives have been spent in an academic atmosphere (pages 94-96). But on this latter point Mr. R. H. Lowrie, in discussing "Science," observes, very wisely as it seems to the reviewer: "We must likewise remember that different individuals react differently to the necessity for teaching. Some of the most noted investigators — Rowland, for instance — find a moderate amount of lecturing positively stimulating" (page 158). Thus it appears that the reader remains at liberty to believe as he pleases concerning the status of historical scholarship in the United States to-day.

The chapters by Mr. R. M. Lovett on "Education" and by Mr. Clarence Britten on "School and college life" betray some of the same defects of information and temper as does Van Loon's essay. Through an inversion of emphasis, college education is discussed by these writers to the virtual exclusion of the elementary and high schools, where, of course, the major problem of American education is to be found. Mr. H. L. Mencken dismisses the complex subject of "Politics" almost as cavalierly as do these authors, for he finds the vital defect in our political system in the residential qualification which is imposed by law or custom upon candidates for office. Mr. W. H. Hamilton on "Economic opinion" and Mr. George Soule on "Radicalism" offer discussions of a distinctly higher order of merit.

It is probable that the future historian of American life will find this

volume valuable not as a criticism of present-day civilization but as an aid to understanding a certain type of intellectual activity and outlook which is well represented in the persons of the authors.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER

History of the United States. By Charles R. Beard and Mary R. Beard. (New York: The Macmillan company, 1921. vii, 663 p.)

The most novel feature of this high school textbook is that it takes for granted that the students who use it have been taught efficiently in the seventh and eighth grades certain things about the history of their country. The authors therefore relieve their pages of any detailed rehearsal of the period of exploration. They also feel free to assume enough maturity in high school students to justify a topical rather than a chronological treatment. They have dealt with movements, have sketched large backgrounds, have traced causes, and have discussed the interrelation of social and economic forces and politics. All this has been directed to the large purpose of helping the student to understand America to-day in all its national characteristics and as part of world civilization as well.

The authors reach the struggle for independence after a discussion, which covers seventy-five pages, of early migration as a transfer of peoples and cultures, and of the development of industries, institutions, and colonial nationalism. "Conflict and independence" is given sixty pages; "The west and Jacksonian democracy," eighty-three pages; "Sectional conflict and reconstruction," eighty-four pages; "National growth and world politics," one hundred and twenty-eight pages; and "Progressive democracy and the world war," one hundred and twenty pages. Questions, research topics, maps, illustrations, excellent bibliographies, and a topical syllabus should help teacher and pupil alike to realize the purpose of the book, which is the development of a thoughtful, informed citizenship.

The literary style is exceptionally clear and crisp and the whole approach to the familiar topics and chapters under the larger divisions named above is thought-producing. As a textbook or a handbook for the average citizen it ranks with the very best.

History of the San Francisco committee of vigilance of 1851. By Mary Floyd Williams. [University of California, Publications in history, volume 12] (Berkeley: University of California press, 1921. 543 p. $5.00)

This book has a fourfold purpose: to serve as a background for the *Papers* of the San Francisco committee of vigilance of 1851 which the Academy of Pacific coast history recently brought out as volume 4 of its publications, edited by Mary Floyd Williams; to portray the condi-

tions of society and politics out of which the vigilance movement logically, if not inevitably, sprang; to furnish an accurate and detailed account of the organization of the committee, its aims, methods of procedure, and accomplishments; and to define the place of the movement in the general field of law enforcement by popular initiative.

With these purposes in mind the author divides her book into two parts. Part 1, which comprises over a third of the actual text, is entitled "The California frontier, 1848 to 1851," and contains a very illuminating description of the perplexing social and political problems of those tense years. Part 2 deals primarily with the committee of 1851 and its activities. This portion of her work the author handles with a sure touch; and the wide range of primary and secondary sources upon which she has drawn for material leaves little room, it would seem, for any further contributions to the subject.

The history of the committee proper closes with chapter 16. Chapter 17, rather misleadingly called "Problems and methods of administration," is in fact devoted very largely to the work of vigilance committees outside of San Francisco. Chapter 18, which furnishes a sort of sequel to the committee of 1851, gives an interesting summary of the social conditions in San Francisco from 1851 to 1877 and includes extended references to the vigilance committee of 1856 and the "Pick Handle Brigade" of 1877. The last two chapters of the book, entitled respectively "Lynch law as a national problem" and "In retrospect," contain much of the author's political philosophy. For interest and permanent value they fall short of the level maintained by their predecessors.

Besides the body of the text, the volume contains eleven pages of biographical notes; a twenty-page appendix consisting of over a score of original documents — manuscript statements, contemporary handbills, proclamations, and the like; an excellent index; and a bibliography of forty-two pages, which constitutes the last word on the literature of the subject.

Though there are a few paragraphs in the volume with which the reviewer cannot agree, for the book as a whole he has no word of criticism worth recording. Miss Williams has done a thorough piece of work and has made excellent use of the storehouse of original material upon which she was privileged to draw. While the documents in the archives of the vigilance committee — now in the Bancroft library, University of California — naturally form the groundwork of her volume, these have been supplemented by many other unpublished manuscripts, extracts from contemporary newspapers, statements from those who themselves played a part in the stirring episodes she records, numerous public documents, and a wide range of secondary sources.

The style of the book is excellent; and the author, without becoming

partisan, shows at all times a sympathetic insight into the character of the men who led the vigilance committee and into the complex problems they were called upon to face. From the records of the committee, as given by Miss Williams, one gains new appreciation of the orderliness and restraint with which the members of that body carried out their self-appointed and often grimly effective task of enforcing law to save society from anarchy or mob rule.

If the reviewer's judgment is not at fault, this history of the San Francisco committee of vigilance of 1851 will stand as the final authority on the subject for many years to come. Miss Williams has made a noteworthy contribution to the movement, now in progress, of the rewriting of California history.

ROBERT G. CLELAND

The Michigan fur trade. By Amanda Johnson. [Michigan historical publications. University series, volume 5] (Lansing: Michigan historical commission, 1919. 201 p.)

It is a source of satisfaction to know that the study of the early American fur trade is beginning to receive the attention which its importance merits. During the past few months there have been an increasing number of monographs and other studies which have added to our somewhat inadequate knowledge of the subject. The investigation of the fur trade presents peculiar difficulties of treatment, which are clearly illustrated in Miss Johnson's monograph. First of all, the fur or peltry trade is a tremendously broad subject, both in point of view of time and of geographical area. It has been carried on, at one time or another, over practically the whole continent. Moreover, it began with the earliest explorations and has continued down to the present, though recently, of course, its relative importance has diminished. The student who approaches the study of the fur trade is confronted with the necessity of limiting his subject in point of time or space or perhaps even both. He may trace the history of the industry from the beginning in a given locality; or he may study it in its broader aspects during a limited period of time. Miss Johnson has chosen the former alternative. During a large part of the period covered by her monograph, Michigan as a political unit did not exist. Her self-imposed limits in the matter of treatment, then, are to a certain extent arbitrary and illogical. In fairness to the author, it should be said that she has endeavored to avoid purely local or antiquarian treatment and has tried to emphasize the broader significance of her subject. The fact that her attention has been centered primarily upon Michigan, however, has occasionally resulted in her losing sight of certain general aspects of the fur trade which are essential to an adequate conception of the industry, with reference to Michigan or any other locality.

Bearing in mind the limitations involved in her choice of a subject, the author's general treatment of the Michigan fur trade is good. Her style is clear and readable and the arrangement of material is excellent. She traces her theme through the French, British, and American periods, and concludes with a descriptive chapter dealing with the lives of the traders and with trading methods. There are frequent summaries and the reader never loses himself in a maze of unfamiliar facts as is his frequent plight when he picks up a doctoral dissertation. The local aspects of the fur trade are well treated and anyone interested in the history of Michigan will find a great deal which will be worth his while. It is when the author ventures to generalize that her treatment of the subject is less satisfactory, for the reasons which have been stated. An example or two may be cited. First of all, Miss Johnson says too little of the character of the fur trade as a business enterprise. During the British period, for example, Montreal was the economic center upon which the entire trade of Michigan and of the Great lakes region depended. The city is mentioned casually in the text, but the name does not occur at all in the index. Even the local trade of Michigan cannot be understood without some more adequate notion of the larger economic organization of which it was only a part. In the final descriptive chapter the author confines her attention almost entirely to the life of the wilderness trader. But what of the merchants established at Michillimackinac and Detroit? What were their relations with the great firms in Montreal? Where did they secure the goods used in trade and what became of the furs which they bought? Again, it is related on page 67 that the British policy of making the trade free to all comers "ended in disaster." Yet during the British régime the trade flourished as never before and British traders secured a hold on the industry in the northwest which was not shaken off until after the close of the war of 1812. English and Scotch merchants operating from Montreal, Detroit, and Michillimackinac had a positive genius for the fur trade and for the management of the Indians, which the author apparently does not appreciate.

There is one instance in which Miss Johnson falls into a somewhat common misstatement of fact, and that is with regard to the origin of the so-called Mackinaw or Michillimackinac company. She says, on page 91, that "what became known as the Mackinaw company was established about 1783-4." The Michillimackinac company was not formed until 1806, but in this case the author has simply repeated the error of predecessors in this field.

It is clear from a careful examination of the bibliography that a good deal of available manuscript material has not been used. There are important manuscript collections in the Canadian archives at Otta-

wa, in the library of the McGill university, and in the Bibliothèque Saint-Sulpice, in Montreal, bearing upon the subject matter of this study. Probably none of this unused material would alter the author's conclusions, but it would throw much light upon the economic aspects of the fur trade, with regard to which very little is said. There are some rather mediocre maps designed to illustrate the text but it would seem that they might have been more useful if they had been inserted at the appropriate places in the text rather than placed at the conclusion, just before the appendix.

Notwithstanding the criticisms which have been offered, Miss Johnson has done an excellent piece of work and further studies of this character will be welcomed.

WAYNE E. STEVENS

The story of American democracy, political and industrial. By Willis Mason West. (New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1920. viii, 758 p.)

The title of a book should give the best possible indication of its contents. This rule, though an elementary maxim of historical composition, is frequently not observed. A common violation is the use of such general terms as "democracy," "nationality," "progress," and "frontier" to cover almost any kind of material. One finally becomes skeptical in regard to books with such terms in their titles.

The book under review is subject to such criticism. The title is misleading. The book is a revision of the author's earlier *American history and government* (New York, 1913), a book the title of which corresponds admirably with the major part of its contents. No more helpful brief manual of American history and government exists for a summary review of our past than this earlier book. It is clear, analytical, well organized, with little questionable interpretation of the period prior to the civil war, and well provided with pedagogical aids. The revised edition, however, goes by another title, without any obviously sound justification. Much in American history, as the contents of this book particularly well reveal, has not been democratic. Aristocracy, oligarchy, or plutocracy are portrayed in the contents of the book and might with considerable validity have been included in the title.

Unfortunately the new book is not provided with the necessary pedagogical aids. It contains no bibliography and little footnote assistance. It seems apparent that it was written for the general reader and was not intended for classroom use. Such an intention is a justification for the new edition, even possibly with its new title, though the size and weight of the book, might, with such an intention, have been considerably reduced.

In content *The story of American democracy* possesses most of the

merits of the earlier book, in addition to the merit of careful reorganization and rephrasing. Also events of the last ten years are included not only in supplementary chapters, but by evolutionary completion of topics and by illustrative comparison. But, with the exception of the last seventy pages, most of the new book is a mere revision of the material of the earlier work, generally identical in language. Illustrations and maps are more abundant, and a few minor errors have been corrected.

New material, not always bearing directly on democracy, is slight. It is widely but lightly scattered throughout the book. In the first part of the book much of this shows more extended use of materials from the author's own *Source book in American history to 1787* (New York, 1913). The references to this new material are numerous.

A few errors of fact or interpretation have not been eliminated from material transferred from the earlier book. The old theory of the closing of the trade routes (page 7) has not succumbed to the assaults of Lybyer. The dissolution of parliament by a seventeenth-century king was not necessarily in itself a "despotic blow" (page 63). The old error of Pinckney's alleged statement, "not one cent for tribute," is perpetuated (page 326). Canning's famous boast is given full validity (page 408). "Paragraphs" in the Monroe doctrine are stated to have been "written" by Adams (page 408). Slavocracy is accused of aggressiveness (page 482) in spite of doubt recently thrown on this matter. And in the light of recent evidence one may question the use of such a general term as "South" in the statement that, in regard to Texas, "our South, too, clamored for annexation" (page 490). The map on the civil war (page 536) might have been greatly improved by the inclusion of important railway lines now omitted. The old idea of American hostility to conscription survives in spite of the world war, in the estimate of the number of drafted men in the union armies at "forty thousand" (page 542) when, according to Provost Marshal General James B. Fry's reports, the number was more than three hundred and forty thousand — 343,764, to be exact. Finally, the comment that "the two races in the South live without social mingling" (page 574), while a statement of fact, indicates a failure to grasp the race problem as a national one of great complexity and importance.

Knowing as one does from Mr. West's earlier writing his vigorous opinions, his trenchant style, and his boldness of statement, one turns with interest to the chapters dealing with the period since the appearance of the *American history and government.* These chapters meet all one's expectations. Rampant nationalism, imperialism, colonialism, militarism, preparedness, war, "frightfulness," selfishness, greed, exploita-

tion, and reaction are unhesitatingly condemned. To one less well informed than he his treatment of the bolsheviki brings, however, a surprise and a shock. The world has been "entertaining angels unawares," it would seem.

On the world war and its causes the book is unsatisfactory. Too much use has been made of war-time pamphlets and too little, of post-war documents. This cannot be justified. Much of the war-time literature was consciously directed propaganda. It included material which was the result of a definite search for just one aspect of matters. No pretense was made that it was a well-rounded presentation of facts. This literature, which may have helped to end the war in victory, is little likely to assist in restoring world order. One is not surprised, however, to observe that this problem of world order Mr. West ranks with the settlement of industrial unrest as a matter on the solution of which civilization depends.

The transplantation on a distant shore of the most liberal ideas and institutions in existence in the seventeenth century, the alterations in these ideas and institutions produced by a new and pioneer environment, the struggle for the survival of these, their spread across a continent, the evolution — as yet only partial — of them in a growing and powerful nation are great subjects for history. Mr. West senses their dramatic interest and their profound importance. A veteran textbook writer, he writes with confidence, conviction, and power. Well, probably, too well, does the author obey the dictates of classicism. "Polish, repolish and every color lay, and sometimes add but oftener take away" is the maxim which, whether wittingly or not, Mr. West follows. The book is remarkably free of typographical errors. If, as is understood, it be intended for the lay reader, it is a distinct success.

Alfred P. James

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

The *Canadian historical review* for June, 1922, has a discussion of "The early days of representative government in British Columbia," by W. N. Sage.

Under the title "The quest of the lonesome tunes," Howard Brockway, in the *Magazine of history* for October, 1921, describes a trip to the mountains of Kentucky in search of old songs.

The address delivered by George F. Parker at Iowa City, on the occasion of the fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association, entitled "The American pioneer and his story," has been published by the State historical society of Iowa.

"Spanish land claims in Missouri," by Eugene Morrow Violette, which originally appeared in volume 8 of the *Washington university studies*, humanistic series, has been reprinted in pamphlet form, as has Ralph Paul Sieber's "British plantation councils of 1670 and 1672."

The *Southwestern historical quarterly* for April, 1922, carries the Bryan-Hayes correspondence from 1857 to 1870. The first part of a study of "The Indian policy of the republic of Texas," by Anna Muckleroy, and an article on "Edward Hopkins Cushing," by E. B. Cushing, make up the rest of the main portion of this number.

The Ohio state university has brought out as its seventh bulletin in the history and political science series *The journal of Alexander Chesney, a South Carolina loyalist in the revolution and after*. The editing, which includes the furnishing of voluminous explanatory notes, has been done by E. Alfred Jones of London. The journal itself is found in the British museum.

Mr. Joseph Schafer's address, "The microscopic method applied to history," read at the annual meeting of the Minnesota historical society on January 17, 1921, is printed in the February-May, 1921, number of the *Minnesota history bulletin*. This issue also contains an account of the 1921 annual meeting of the society, as well as copies of the "correspondence occasioned by the dinner in honor of Dr. Folwell."

The *American political science review* for May, 1922, has for a leading article a discussion of "The United States and world organization," by Edwin D. Dickinson. Mr. Dickinson concludes that while "world organization promises no millenium . . . it does promise new and greater opportunities for progress in the maintenance of peace. By the fundamental traditions of its foreign policy and by every consideration of self-interest, the United States is required to take a helpful and an influential part."

Four articles of local interest make up the body of the June, 1922, number of the *Indiana magazine of history*. These are "Crawford county," by H. H. Pleasant; "Pioneer stories of the calumet," by J. W. Lester; "History of the knownothing party in Indiana," by Carl F. Brand; and "The McGowan murder at Hindustan," by William McGowan. The account of the know-nothing party may, indeed, be considered of more than local interest in that it is to restricted studies of this sort that eventually will be due a clearer picture of national movements.

The *Journal of negro history* for April, 1922, has some extracts and letters collected by R. E. Park and Booker T. Washington. The letters are of various dates and from various sources and all contain matter relative to the negro race in America. Contributed articles include "Negro congressmen a generation after," by Alrutheus A. Taylor; "The priority of the Silver Bluff [South Carolina] church and its promoters," by Walter H. Brooks; and "The negroes in Mauritius," by A. F. Foster.

A very interesting narrative of "A trip across the plains in 1857" is printed in the April, 1922, *Iowa journal of history and politics*. This account of a journey to Salt Lake and California was written by William Clark from notes which he took on the way and subsequently destroyed. The manuscript of the completed story is now in the possession of the Iowa society, having been presented to it by Mrs. Louis Bernard Schmidt of Ames. Jacob A. Swisher has an article on "The judiciary of the territory of Iowa" in the same issue.

Along with articles more particularly devoted to specific problems of government the *Political science quarterly* for June, 1922, has two which attract the attention of the student of American history; namely, "Some leading phases of the evolution of modern penology," by Harry Elmer Barnes, and "Proportional representation in American cities," by Howard Lee McBain. The latter calls for especial note in that it is in the towns of the Mississippi valley generally that proportional and preferential voting schemes have been given the greatest opportunity to prove their merits.

Numbers 1 and 2 of volume 17 of the *Quarterly publication of the historical and philosophical society of Ohio* (January-June, 1922) contain a reproduction in full of the "Memoirs of Benjamin Van Cleve," edited by Beverly W. Bond, Jr. Portions of the memoirs were printed earlier in the *American pioneer*, while the manuscript itself, a substantial blank book now in the possession of Mrs. Anna Dover McKnight of Dayton, has been copied and the typed copy has been deposited in the Dayton public library. In the convenient pamphlet form issued by the society this memoir affords a valuable addition to the materials available for the study of conditions in the Ohio country at the close of the eighteenth century.

The supplement to volume 12, number 1, of the *American economic review* (March, 1922) contains the papers and proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual meeting of the American economic association. Among the papers and the reports of discussions which followed the reading of them are several which contain grist for the mill of the historian, notably two on the financial crisis of 1920 in the United States by Warren M. Persons and Wesley C. Mitchell, and two on trade unionism in American industries by George E. Barnett and W. M. Leiserson. Other contributions include: "The railroad situation," by Walter D. Hines; "The core of the railroad problem," by Logan G. McPherson; "The present status of workmen's compensation in the United States," by E. H. Downey; and "Industrial accident and compensation statistics," by Charles H. Verrill.

William G. Bek in his latest contribution on "The followers of Duden," in the *Missouri historical review* for April, 1922, includes some interesting bits of description of American society in the Mississippi valley as noted by German observers, as well as an account of a journey from Baltimore into the western regions as told by Gert Goebel. Wiley Britton describes "Pioneer life in southwestern Missouri;" John N. Edwards' "Shelby's expedition to Mexico" is reprinted in part; and under the heading, "Records of Missouri confederate veterans," the intention of the United daughters of the confederacy, Missouri division, to collect available records is noted. Seekers for bits of recondite lore will be glad to observe the researches which have been made to trace the origin of the expression "I'm from Missouri, you've got to show me," and the sum total of the findings to date as printed in this issue.

C. B. Galbreath has two contributions in the October, 1921, issue of the *Ohio archæological and historical quarterly*, one on the "Anti-slavery movement in Columbiana county," and the other on "Edwin Coppee." The same magazine has an account of the unveiling of a tablet at Campus

Martius house at Marietta. The January, 1922, issue contains an account of "The political campaign of 1875 in Ohio," by Forrest William Clounts, and several papers stimulated by the Bucyrus centennial. The April number has articles on "General Joshua Woodrow Sill," by Albert Douglas; "The pillars of Harrison county," by Joseph T. Harrison; "Seneca John, Indian chief," by Basil Meek; "The Ohio state university in the world war," by Wilbur H. Siebert; and "Three anti-slavery newspapers," by Annetta C. Walsh.

In the October, 1920, *Journal of the Illinois state historical society* is printed the diary of Salome Paddock Enos, 1815-1860, with a note by Louise I. Enos. Contributed articles in the same number include: "Illinois women of the middle period," by Arthur C. Cole; "The building of a state: the story of Illinois," by A. Mile Bennett; "Life in the army," a story, including excerpts from letters, of army life in California in the late sixties and the seventies, by an army officer's wife, Cynthia J. Capron; "Some personal recollections of Peter Cartwright," by William Epler; the "History of the Selma Methodist Episcopal church," by A. V. Pierson; "Miss Mary Coles, daughter of Governor Edward Coles, 1834-1920: an appreciation," by Florence F. Caldwell; and "Some things I did in my 88th year," by Charles E. Cox.

The articles in the *Hispanic American historical review* for February, 1922, deal mostly with Latin American subjects outside the field of United States history. One of the documents, edited by Ralph S. Kuykendall, has to do with "An American ship-builder for California." There are studies of "The treaty of Tordesillas and the Argentine-Brazilian boundary settlement," by Mary Wilhelmine Williams, "New constitutional tendencies in Hispanic America," by Manuel de Oliveira Lima, the "Central American union," by Edward Perry, and "The government of Argentina," by Austin F. Macdonald. In the bibliographical section is an "Estudio de la bibliografia sobre la doctrina de Monroe," by Carlos M. Trelles, and "Chilean literature; a bibliography of criticism, biography, and literary controversy: part 1," by Sturgis E. Leavitt.

In the *Palimpsest* for May, 1922, there is an account, written by the editor, John C. Parish, of "The first Mississippi bridge," that which was built across the river at Rock Island. Following this is a partial account of a trial before the United States circuit court at St. Louis, reprinted from the *Chicago Daily Press* of September 24, 1857. Abraham Lincoln was one of the attorneys defending the bridge company against the steamboat owners who brought suit, and the excerpt consists principally of Lincoln's argument. The other contributed paper in this number is

"Hummer's bell," by Ruth A. Gallaher. The April issue reprints, under the title "In the neutral ground," a selection from Willard Barrows' *Twelve nights in the hunter's camp*, published in 1869. This number also has "The wedding of James Harlan," by Johnson Brigham, and an account of "A visit to Dubuque's grave."

Some years ago there appeared in the *Register of the Kentucky state historical society* a portion of the correspondence between Governor Isaac Shelby of Kentucky and General William Henry Harrison during the war of 1812. The May, 1922, issue of the same publication contains the remainder of this interesting series of letters from the letter books in the possession of the Kentucky society. The leading article of this issue consists of a number of newspaper comments occasioned by the death of Colonel Henry Watterson. Other features include "The discovery of Kentucky," by Willard Rouse Jillson, which is, as the subtitle explains, "an exposition of the mythical character of the several explorations ascribed to Kentucky prior to actual discovery by Gabriel Arthur, Virginian, in 1674"; a "History of the county court of Lincoln county, Va. (now Kentucky)," by Lucien Beckner; "Oil and gas in the Big Sandy valley," by Dr. Jillson; the story of "A unique railroad," by Martha Stephenson; "First explorations of Daniel Boone in Kentucky," by Dr. Jillson; and "Reminiscences from the life of Colonel Cave Johnson."

A problem arising out of large classes in different fields of history has been presented to library administrations and department staffs in many of the larger universities of the country. The question is, what is to be done to supply students with printed materials? Duplicates run into money and prevent additions along new lines; moreover, some works cannot be duplicated and are threatened with dissolution through constant wear. At the University of Wisconsin an attempt to find a solution has led to the reprinting of materials most extensively used in small pamphlets. Such a one is put out under the title "The foundations of American neutrality," and contains selections from public documents and from the writings of Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton to illustrate the diplomatic history of the United States in the last decade of the eighteenth century. The pamphlet is compiled by Carl R. Fish under the editorship of James L. Sellers.

The Indiana historical commission has published the *Proceedings of the third annual conference on Indiana history*. The conference was held under the auspices of the Society of Indiana pioneers, the Indiana historical society, and the Indiana historical commission. In addition

to accounts of what is being done along lines of historical study in various communities, the pamphlet prints papers by ex-Governor Samuel M. Ralston on "Jonathan Jennings, the first governor of Indiana"; by Colonel Robert L. Moorhead on "The value and importance of historical markers"; by Edgar T. Forsyth on "The writing of family histories"; by Rufus Dooley on "Indiana's part in the Butler expedition to New Orleans during the civil war"; by George R. Wilson on "Local pioneer history as seen through local pioneer laws"; by Ben F. Stuart on "The possibilities of historical pilgrimages — local organizations"; by Anna C. O'Flynn on "Creole customs in old Vincennes"; by the Reverend M. L. Haines on "An appreciation of John H. Holliday"; and by Mrs. Demarchus C. Brown on "Some old-fashioned Indiana writers."

The Illinois state historical library is preparing for publication in the *Illinois historical collections* the diary of Orville H. Browning, which it recently acquired from Browning's niece, Mrs. Eliza Price Miller. The diary covers the later and more important part of Browning's career, beginning in 1850 and ending with his death in 1881. He was one of the founders of the republican party in the state of Illinois and served as United States senator from 1861 to 1863, being in very close touch with President Lincoln during the critical period of the civil war. He served as secretary of the interior in the cabinet of President Johnson and as member of the Illinois constitutional convention of 1869-1870. For American history in the period of the civil war and reconstruction the diary has remarkable importance. It is perhaps the most important piece on the politics of the civil war that has come to light since the publication of Welles's diary. The diary is being edited by Mr. Theodore C. Pease, editor of the *Illinois historical collections*, and Mr. James G. Randall, of the University of Illinois. The diary will be sent to press some time in 1923.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. IX, NO. 3 DECEMBER, 1922

NATIVISM IN THE FORTIES AND FIFTIES, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY [1]

In one of Bacon's apophthegms we read that Solon compared the people unto the sea, and orators and counsellors to the winds; for that the sea would be calm and quiet, if the winds did not trouble it.

In the United States the winds of nativism blow periodically, and the populace from the Atlantic to the Pacific becomes exceedingly troubled. As if to mock the fears of many tried souls, the ship of state majestically rides the storm-tossed sea amidst the wreckage of political fortunes and political parties. The region of greatest concentration of migrant nativist storms is over New England, the north Atlantic states, the south, and the Pacific coast, where the precipitation is chiefly riots, political agitation, legislation, and constitutional amendments.

If we may transfer the figure from meteorology to metallurgy, the "one hundred per cent American" of the forties and fifties regarded the Mississippi valley as a melting pot where nothing melted but the pure gold of Americanism. The baser metals, drawn from the inexhaustible mines of Europe and transported across the Atlantic in ill-smelling emigrant ships, — Fourierism, socialism, catholicism, Lutheranism, Mormonism, agrarianism, intemperance, atheism, and radicalism generally, — would forever remain amalgamated with the German, Irish, Swedish, and Norwegian jargons.

If the fathers of the constitution had been endowed with one hundred per cent infallibility and had written into that document: "No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of

[1] This paper was read at the fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at Iowa City on May 12, 1922.

the United States at the time of the adoption of this constitution, shall be eligible to public office within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction," instead of limiting the qualification to the office of president, the historian might have been spared the task of delving into the mysteries of the know-nothings and the latter-day Ku Klux Klan, reading orations of the A. P. A. agitators, paying his respects to the hyphenates, and summarizing the benevolent achievements of the exponents of the Americanization movement. And more, the dream of founding a German state in the Mississippi valley might never have been dreamed; the debate over printing the president's message in German might never have been;[2] the resolutions of sympathy for Irish independence might possibly not have assumed such importance in legislative bodies; and schemes for attracting the foreign-born voters would never have disturbed the slumber of a single politician.

But these troublesome chapters of American history and many more must be written, for what the fathers had written they had written. And the gates stood ajar. The gates of Europe swung open wide for the emissaries of western states, for the paid agents of steamship companies, railroads, and corporations, born with persuasive tongues and armed with irresistible pamphlets, for zealous Mormon missionaries who preached the economic salvation of the Illinois prairies and the irrigation ditches of Utah as well as the doctrine of plural wives, for the millions of "America letters" which omitted no word to proclaim the wonders of America and the prosperity of the writers. And the gates of America swung open even wider to admit the increasing mass of humanity, clamoring for the fabulous wages of the New England factory, the lucrative remuneration of the railroad section hand, the limitless opportunities of the housemaid, or the cheap lands of the west.

And where were the guardians of American ideals during these perilous years? Many were drawing up party slates and

[2] December 11, 1843. After considerable discussion in the house of representatives over the proposal to print the president's message in French and German, the vote on the motion to lay the matter on the table was 86 to 86. By the affirmative vote of the speaker the motion carried. *Congressional globe,* 28 congress, 1 session, pp. 42-44.

discussing political candidates behind the closed doors of a know-nothing lodge; others were writing books entitled "The sons of the sires," "The crisis: or, the enemies of America unmasked," "A defense of the American policy," "The great American battle; or, the contest between christianity and political romanism," "Republican landmarks," and the like,[3] with formidable statistics; some were delivering addresses on "The sabbath and free institutions," "Home missions," and "A plea for the west";[4] pious men and women were contributing their substance to missionary societies which sent out colporteurs to carry the gospel to the foreigners in the widely scattered settlements of the west; a number pinned their faith on education and lent their aid in the establishment of institutions of learning, whose rays would dispel the European darkness; the lawless joined mobs which sacked Catholic churches and convents; and the most effective element buttonholed senators and representatives in behalf of stringent naturalization and immigration laws.

Know-nothingism had its habitat in the fifties, but a nativism has roamed the domain of American politics in every decade.

[3] *The sons of the sires; a history of the rise, progress, and destiny of the American party, and its probable influence on the next presidential election,* by an American (Philadelphia, 1855); J. Wayne Laurens, *The crisis, or the enemies of America unmasked* (Philadelphia, 1855); Thomas R. Whitney, *A defence of the American policy, as opposed to the encroachments of foreign influence, and especially to the interference of the papacy in the political interests and affairs of the United States* (New York, 1856); Anna Ella Caroll, *The great American battle; or, the contest between christianity and political Romanism* (New York, 1859); John P. Sanderson, *Republican landmarks. The views and opinions of American statesmen on foreign immigration. Being a collection of statistics of population, pauperism, crime, etc. With an inquiry into the character of the United States government, and its policy on the subject of immigration, naturalization of aliens, etc.* (Philadelphia, 1856); Thomas Bangs Thorpe, *A voice to America; or, the model republic, its glory, or its fall: with a review of the causes of the decline and failure of the republics of South America, Mexico, and of the old world, applied to the present crisis in the United States* (New York, 1855); Samuel C. Busey, *Immigration: its evils and consequences* (New York, 1856); *Startling facts for native Americans called "know-nothings," or a vivid presentation of the dangers to American liberty, to be apprehended from foreign influence* (New York, 1855); James Raymond, *Political: or, the spirit of democracy in '56* (Baltimore, 1857).

[4] Mark Hopkins, "The sabbath and free institutions," a sermon delivered before the American and sabbath union, May, 1847, in the *American national preacher,* 21:125-141; Albert Barnes, *Home missions. A sermon in behalf of the American home missionary society: preached in the cities of New York and Philadelphia, May, 1849* (New York, 1849); Lyman Beecher, *A plea for the west* (Cincinnati, 1835).

Nativism has been called a disease, but it is hardly that; it is rather a symptom of disorder in the body politic. The disease is indigestion caused not primarily by overeating but by failure to keep the organs of society in proper condition to perform their functions. The average politician is a notoriously bad diagnostician. He prescribes for political parties when the disorder is organic. He beats the political tomtom to frighten the evil spirits. The public summons the politician when it ought to entrust the case to the social reformer. George Henry Evans, a radical of the forties with little confidence in political parties, was deeply concerned over the trend of his time, but, instead of joining in the cry for laws regulating naturalization and immigration, set himself to the task of ascertaining why every able-bodied immigrant should not be accorded a hearty welcome. Free land and land limitation was his cureall. And free land did tone up the system, although not everyone was aware of its tonic properties.[5]

The extraordinary outburst of nativism in the two decades preceding the civil war was due to a remarkable combination of circumstances, but know-nothingism is something more than political proscription; the obviousness of its political aspects has greatly magnified that phase of the movement. Fear of foreign influence was present before the organization of the know-nothing party and it has lingered since its disruption. Many who joined the party were scheming politicians and young men ambitious for political office who played on the string of racial hatred to attract the hosts of political orphans after the demise of the whig party and the defection from the democracy. In the aggregate, hostility to the foreign-born is as patent today as it was in the know-nothing period, but it is less frank. The newspaper editors of the forties and fifties who feared the effect of the influx of hordes of Germans and Irish were not afraid to record their fears on the editorial page; since that time, however, with the exception of most recent years and of those publications whose stock-in-trade is racial and religious prejudice, the press has generally maintained silence.

[5] Evans voiced his economic doctrines through the medium of the *Working Man's Advocate*, published in New York. For some account of Evans and his work, see George M. Stephenson, *The political history of the public lands from 1840-1862, from pre-emption to homestead* (Boston, 1917), 105-111.

Notwithstanding the fact that there have always been Americans who have harbored misgivings over the infusion of non-English-speaking peoples, aliens have generally been welcome — even sought after — by states, corporations, and individuals. The prevailing sentiment has been: "We have room for the oppressed of the whole earth." The question has often assumed a sectional hue, depending on conditions at a given time. The newer section of the country — the west — has usually favored immigration. Cheap land, unlimited opportunities, sparse population, and an unbounded optimism have reduced friction and facilitated assimilation. The east — the section of special interests, powerful labor organizations, congested cities, and a Brahmin caste — has been more skeptical. The south, curiously enough, untouched until recently by the great flood of immigrants but plagued by an appalling racial problem, has usually lent its support to proscriptive and restrictive measures. A threatened tidal wave of oriental immigration, real or imaginary, has kept the Pacific coast in a turmoil almost since the first Chinese coolie set foot on California soil.

That our legislative bodies do not always register the desires of their constituents is clearly revealed in the fact that since 1897 four general immigration bills embodying a literacy test have passed congress by heavy majorities, to meet the veto of the chief executive. Only under the stress of an impending war, when racial feeling was boiling furiously, was the two-thirds majority necessary to override the veto mustered. A superficial explanation of this bit of political history may be ventured. Individual congressmen, yielding to pressure from local interests, or provincial in their outlook, have voted for these measures, while the presidents, with a wider horizon and confident of the approval of a national majority, have stamped disapproval.

"Politics perverts whatever it touches," wrote a citizen of New Orleans in 1854, "both men and things. This is owing to several causes, among which I shall point out the two principal. The first is, that, by a strange abuse, politics have become an easy, though not very honorable, source of support for many who can devote their whole time to the attainment of success, and who hold all means toward their end to be good. The second

is, that the true friends of liberty, to whatever party they belong, are not animated with sufficient earnestness and devotion to defend her against the assaults of men actuated solely by a self-seeking ambition. . . .

"Among the many things which are perverted by politics is what we call *Nativism.* It has been turned into an electioneering weapon, and unscrupulous declaimers, in their inflammatory appeals to the multitude, have branded as a crime a feeling which is in every man's heart, which is highly honorable when circumscribed within proper limits. If we look below the surface, we shall see that Nativism is a component part of patriotism, and that it is the chief element in that complex thing which is called nationality. . . . Patriotism involves a preference; it is consequently a preference of one's country and one's fellow-citizens over all foreign countries and citizens and subjects. . . .

"Let me now state what I mean by Nativism. Men who, in their own country, lack not only political rights, but the necessary quantum of protection and comfort, emigrate to a land blessed with a liberal government, in quest of an easier life and the rights of freemen. . . . Humanity and the liberal character of republican institutions, require that everything be granted to these strangers that can be useful to them, provided that no injury result to their new country. . . .

"Let us, therefore, grant to our naturalized fellow-citizens all that can enlarge their means of support, all that can satisfy their legitimate ambition; but let us not, by intrusting them with certain offices, expose them to an inward struggle between two affections equally noble in their origin, but necessarily productive of most distressing pangs, when a choice has to be made. With a tender regard for conscience, let us keep our naturalized fellow-citizens aloof from those exalted political stations which might put them, one day, in the sad necessity of choosing between their former and their present brethren."[6]

During the nineteenth century political philosophers and newspaper editors insisted that suffrage was a boon — a privilege, not a right — but since the adoption of the nineteenth amendment that view can no longer be take seriously. The women

[6] "A few words on native Americanism," in *Brownson's quarterly review,* third series, 11:328-334.

demanded suffrage as a right, with no thanks to the congress and the legislatures which conferred it upon them. While we no longer treat women as sojourners among us, we still think of our foreign-born as guests enjoying our hospitality. A nation will never be pleased to find foreigners forgetting that they are its guests, wrote O. A. Brownson in the days of know-nothingism, assuming the airs of natural-born citizens and proceeding at once to take the management of its affairs upon themselves, or even volunteering their advice.[7] The one hundred per cent American wants his political speeches delivered in the language of the country store or of the rotary club and not with the accent of the Swedish janitor or of the Italian fruit peddler.

A distinguished student of American history who has pointed out that American society has been continually beginning over again, that the frontier was the melting pot which fused the customs, ideals, and traditions of an older society, has also written that with the influx of foreigners into New England social homogeneity diminished; that "the mother section of greater New England did not exhibit the free intercourse and mutual adjustment of different classes and nationalities observable contemporaneously in the states of the North Central Group."[8]

Lyman Beecher, the "Americanization worker" of the thirties and forties, toured the cities of the Atlantic seaboard exhorting his countrymen to be alive to the dark designs of the potentates of Europe on the civil and ecclesiastical liberties of the western pioneers. Blind both to the isomerism of the Mississippi valley and to the adamant social crust of New England, he would call the righteous to repentance in churches erected through the munificence of hardened sinners.

"It is. . . plain that the political destiny of our nation is to be decided in the West," said Beecher. "There is the territory, and there will soon be the population, the wealth, and the political power. The Atlantic commerce and manufacturers may confer always some peculiar advantage on the East. But the West is destined to be the great central power of the nation, and un-

[7] *Brownson's quarterly review,* third series, 11:337.

[8] Frederick J. Turner, "Greater New England in the middle of the nineteenth century," in American antiquarian society, *Proceedings,* new series, 29:235.

der heaven, must affect powerfully the cause of free institutions and the liberty of the world.

"The West is a young empire of mind, and power, and wealth, and free institutions, rushing up to a giant manhood, with a rapidity and power never before witnessed below the sun. And if she carries with her the elements of her preservation, the experiment will be glorious — the joy of the nation — the joy of the whole earth, as she rises in the majesty of her intelligence and benevolence, and enterprise, for the emancipation of the world . . . .

"I am aware that our ablest patriots are looking out on the deep, vexed with storms, with great foreboding and failings of heart for fear of the things that are coming upon us; and I perceive a spirit of impatience rising, and distrust in respect to the perpetuity of our republic; and I am sure that these fears are well founded, and am glad that they exist. It is the star of hope in our dark horizon . . . .

"The danger from uneducated mind is augmenting daily by the rapid influx of foreign emigrants, unacquainted with our institutions, unaccustomed to self-government, inaccessible to education, and easily accessible to prepossession, and inveterate credulity, and intrigue, and easily embodied and wielded by sinister design. In the beginning this eruption of revolutionary Europe was not anticipated, and we opened our doors wide to the influx and naturalization of foreigners. But it is becoming a terrific inundation; it has increased upon our native population from five to thirty-seven per cent, and is every year advancing. It seeks, of course, to settle down upon the unoccupied territory of the West, and may at no distant day equal, and even outnumber the native population. What is to be done to educate the millions which in twenty years Europe will pour out upon us?" [9]

New England and the east were fearfully earnest about this question. Missionary societies sprang into being for the express purpose of sending out colporteurs to seek out the homes of the Irishman, the German, and the Scandinavian, scattered far and wide over the great valley. According to the annual report of

[9] Beecher, *A plea for the west*, 11 ff.

"The Boston ladies' association for evangelizing the west" for 1844, "the spiritual condition of a large part of the German population in this country is such as to excite the deepest sympathy. Without an adequate ministry; without Sabbath school instruction to a great extent; without Bibles in many cases; without an evangelical literature for young and old, where can there be found a population of equal numbers, presenting a stronger claim to the prayers and charities of American christians than this? . . . . No time should be lost in extending the system of colportage to the whole German population, Protestant or Romanist." [10]

Could New England morals, religion, and culture flourish on the western prairies? Would not the noxious weeds of atheism, radicalism, catholicism, and intemperance choke the recently transplanted Americanism? Was not the American conception of freedom vastly different from the purely negative notion of the radicals and revolutionists of continental Europe? Would not the naturalization of these men be an empty formality? The law naturalized the old Adam; the New England missionary naturalized the heart.[11] This supremely important task could not be entrusted to the eastern men who had migrated to the west, for the greater number among them succumbed to the environment. "They make the liquid fire to burn out the conscience and character of the people. They blot out the sacred day of rest from the calendar in their eager pursuit of gain. The material interests of new settlements become so engrossing, that, without some strong counteracting power from without, or from within, the degeneracy must be rapid. Almost every thought of every day is demanded for some outward employ-

[10] Boston ladies' association for evangelizing the west, *Annual report*, 1844, p. 10 ff. The *Home missionary* reflects the eastern attitude toward the Germans, the Irish, and the Scandinavians. The 1884 *Annual report* of the Boston ladies' association recounts (pp. 4, 5) the following remarks of an atheist in Wisconsin to the Reverend Mr. Clark: "Ye'r Christians down east have strange notions of we westerners. Don't ye know that we all came from the east, and ain't quite heathens any how? Ye needn't suppose we are the most awful creatures ever 'dug up,' for we came from the very midst of ye; and ye needn't send any more of ye'r priests and tracts out this way, for we ain't heathens yet."

[11] *Home missionary*, April, 1856; Edward Norris Kirk, *The church essential to the republic. A sermon in behalf of the American home missionary society. Preached in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, May, 1848* (New York, 1848).

ment . . . . Money is scarce, sickness abounds, medical aid is remote, and often of questionable value . . . . There is little leisure for reading, and books are scarce."[12] "Emigration, or a new settlement of the social state," said Horace Bushnell in 1847, "involves a tendency to social decline. There must, in every such case, be a relapse towards barbarism, more or less protracted, more or less complete. . . . Our first danger is barbarism — Romanism next."[13] To him it was foolish to say that Romanism could not grow and spread in the United States. He needed no other proof than that the great Mormon city and temple, that "wretched and silly delusion," could gather its thousands.

The great increase of the population of the west and of the foreign-born revealed in the census of 1850 was a matter of grave concern both to the benevolent nativists and to the professional politicians. They were painfully conscious of the fact that the scepter had passed away from the older sections into "the hands of a people strong in their impulses, conscious of their rapidly growing strength, and ambitious of using it."[14] Many believed that the situation called for something more drastic than the gospel of Jesus Christ. The process of fashioning the heart and mind of the individual immigrant to the American pattern was a long one, and in the meantime protection must be afforded by legislation in the form of a naturalization law requiring a residence of twenty-one years before citizenship could be acquired.

Speeches in behalf of this measure were made by representatives from every section, but it was in the south especially that the proposition made its greatest appeal. The census of 1850 was more alarming to the southerner than to the easterner. Senator Adams of Mississippi in a speech on the bill to amend

[12] Kirk, *The church essential to the republic.*

[13] Horace Bushnell, *Barbarism the first danger. A discourse for home missions* (New York, 1847). The anti-catholic literature of the forties and fifties is so voluminous that only a few examples are cited: Joseph F. Berg, *A lecture delivered in the musical fund hall (Philadelphia), on Tuesday evening, November 26, 1850, in answer to Archbishop Hughes on the decline of protestantism* (Philadelphia, 1850); Nicholas Murray, *The decline of popery and its causes. An address delivered in the Broadway tabernacle, on Wednesday evening, January 15, 1851* (New York, 1851); *Address of the board of managers of the American protestant association; with the constitution and organization of the association* (Philadelphia, 1843).

[14] *Home missionary,* July, 1851, pp. 57-59.

the naturalization laws in 1856 pointed out that the north had gained twenty representatives through immigration to four for the south, and that eighteen of that number had arrived in the decade of the forties. The evils of foreign-born suffrage were undoubtedly great in the cities of the east, where immigrants were naturalized wholesale and herded to the polls by ward heelers. The great bulk of these probably voted the democratic ticket, knowing little and caring less about the slavery question; but the Germans, the Scandinavians, and the Dutch did not allow their admiration for Jefferson and Jackson to outweigh their hostility to the institution of slavery and their antagonism to the south, whose senators by their votes had defeated the homestead bill.[15]

The integrity of a national nativist party depended upon the ability of its leaders to keep the slavery question in the background, but the tragic events following hard upon the enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska act rendered this impossible. The national know-nothing party was predestined to fail, but nativism might have remained a paramount issue — might even have been featured by the republican party — had it not been for the attitude of the northern Mississippi valley. The antislavery element in the know-nothing party was so strong that the democratic party could pose as the champion of the rights of the foreign-born; but the very fact that the party could not gather in the German, Scandinavian, and Dutch naturalized voters shows how important the slavery issue was.

The more level-headed republican leaders in the east were well aware of the antislavery sentiments of the immigrants and coveted their support, but they were chary about offending the hordes of orphaned know-nothings who sought political shelter in the republican camp, and they were for a time unable to restrain the die-hard recruits, who proposed nativist planks in republican conventions. The average politician is primarily interested in himself, and for that reason looks after the political fences in his own district or state. To his way of thinking, local success is more important than a national victory.[16] In New

[15] This question is discussed in Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands*, chapter 11, with citations.

[16] In a letter to Schuyler Colfax, July 6, 1859, Lincoln points out the danger in

England and in certain eastern states the Irish outnumbered the other naturalized citizens, and the republicans had small prospects of jarring them loose from the democracy. With nothing to lose from the Irish Catholics and much to gain from the intensely protestant native population the republican legislature of Massachusetts as late as 1859 adopted by an overwhelming majority an amendment to the state constitution providing that no person of foreign birth should be entitled to vote or should be eligible to office unless he had resided within the jurisdiction of the United States for two years subsequent to his naturalization.[17] This action of the Massachusetts legislature and republican flirtations with know-nothingism in other eastern states [18] placed the national republican party in jeopardy by making republican success doubtful in the northwest, where the Germans, the Scandinavians, and the Dutch were a force to be reckoned with.[19]

The New England missionaries and ministers in order to loosen the purse strings of their parishoners presented an exaggerated picture of the foreign settlements in the west. Although the sons of New England who had cast their lot in the Mississippi valley considered themselves superior to the foreigners, they mingled with them and exhibited a spirit of give and take. In New England everybody talked about the foreigner, but few talked to him. In the shirt-sleeve society of the west it was different. The immigrant was estimated more nearly at his worth. He was industrious and law-abiding, and contributed to the development of the new community. At first hand he was found to be appreciative of the opportunities Amer-

the temptation of different localities "to platform" for something which will be popular just there, but which nevertheless will be a firebrand elsewhere, especially in a national convention. He cites the movement against foreigners in Massachusetts. F. I. Herriott, "The premises and significance of Abraham Lincoln's letter to Theodore Canisius," in *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter,* 15:181-254.

[17] Herriott, "The Germans of Iowa and the 'two-year amendment' of Massachusetts," in *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter,* 13:202-308.

[18] *Minnesota Staats Zeitung* (St. Paul), March 26, 1859; *Daily Pioneer and Democrat* (St. Paul), September 14, 1859.

[19] For extracts from editorials in the German papers, see Herriott, "The Germans of Iowa and the 'two-year amendment'," in *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter,* 13:202-308. See also *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* August 6, September 3, October 1, 1859; *Emigranten,* a Norwegian newspaper of Madison, Wisconsin, June 6, 1859; Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands,* 221 ff.

ica had given him, and he expressed little desire to return to his native land.

It is not to be thought that the Mississippi valley was entirely free from nativism.[20] The fact is that the know-nothing party in some states upset the plans of more than one democratic and republican campaign;[21] but by the beginning of the year 1857 the naturalized vote had been lashed into such fury by the agitation of the know-nothings that the candidate for office with a know-nothing record stood about as much chance of election as would the editor of the *Menace* in modern Boston.

It was a different game from this time on. Its strategy consisted in pinning the stigma of know-nothingism on the rival parties and candidates, with the two year amendment, stringent naturalization laws, and opposition to a liberal homestead bill the badges of infamy.[22]

With a vision and a courage that was willing to sacrifice immediate success, certain abolitionist leaders who had joined the republican party waged unceasing warfare against the fusion with the know-nothings and know-nothingism, because it ignored the antislavery cause. George W. Julian of Indiana, an ardent abolitionist and unceasing advocate of a liberal homestead law,

[20] In 1857 Carl Schurz, republican candidate for lieutenant governor of Wisconsin, was defeated, running far behind the ticket. This "struck like thunder into the ranks of naturalized citizens" in the west. See editorial, "Are the Germans bolters?" in *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* October 1, 1859.

[21] Gustave Koerner, *Memoirs, 1809-1896. Life sketches written at the suggestion of his children* (edited by Thomas J. McCormack — Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1909), 2:22, 23, 37, 38; Albert B. Hart, *Salmon Portland Chase* (Boston, 1899), 152, 153; Floyd B. Streeter, "The factional character of early Michigan politics," in *Michigan history magazine,* 2:165-191; Ovando J. Hollister, *The life of Schuyler Colfax* (New York, 1886), 101-104; Robert B. Warden, *An account of the private life and public services of Salmon Portland Chase* (Cincinnati, 1874), 346, 347; *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* June 4, 1859; *Daily Pioneer and Democrat,* September 14, 1859.

[22] In a letter dated June 17, 1859, to Felix Le Clerc, a naturalized citizen residing at Memphis, Tennessee, Secretary of state Cass stated that the United States government would not undertake to protect him from arrest, fine, or imprisonment by France, should he return to his native land and be seized on account of delinquent military service. When the letter was made public, the administration was deluged with editorial protests from the foreign language press. Republican politicians welcomed the document as a most effective set-off to the two-year amendment. See Herriott, "The Germans of Iowa and the 'two-year amendment'," in *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter,* 13:268 ff; *Emigranten,* June 27, July 18, 1859; *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* September 10, 1859, *Daily Minnesotian* (St. Paul), September 10, 1859; Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands,* chapter 14.

took the stump and in scathing language exposed the hypocrisy of the nativists. He pictured "American Protestantism stealing the very livery of the Jesuits, and at the same time raising the war-cry against Rome." "It should not strain at the gnat of American Catholicism, whilst it swallows down at one gulp the huge camel of American slavery." He waxed sarcastic over American protestant slaveholders in the south seeking to "Americanize" and christianize Catholics. "In this particular they seem to fill the Know-nothing measure, for they are completely 'Americanized'!" "And how is it . . . that the zeal of our Northern Know-nothings waxes so strong against 'Babylonian abominations,' whilst here we have a Native American Babylon, upheld by our Protestant sects, whose infernal sway over three millions and a half of human beings for whom Christ died makes the corruption of Rome dwindle into insignificance." [23]

Julian had little fear of the political influence of foreigners. He was confident that the papacy would have to accomodate itself to American conditions. "Every school-house is a barrier against it. Every printing press is a battlement. Every steam-car is a battering-ram to break it to pieces." "The creed that tries men by the latitude and longitude of their birthplace, instead of their character, and honors and degrades them accordingly, is not only Pagan, but monstrous." He refuted the assertion that the immigrants were hostile to freedom and haters of the negro by pointing to their choice of the free states as their home, and to the opposition of the south to immigration. He reminded his auditors that many natives were as unfit for citizenship as foreigners; that the foreign-born were not the only ones addicted to drunkenness, profanation of the sabbath, ruffianism, and illiteracy.

Julian's method of advancing the antislavery cause was to organize the republican party, to shun every form of partnership with know-nothingism, which had been a thorn in the side of republicanism and a sure help for the old-time democracy, and to give up hope of immediate success.

James W. Grimes of Iowa, another sturdy and uncompris-

[23] George W. Julian, "The slavery question in its present relation to American politics," in Julian, *Speeches on political questions* (New York, 1872), 109 ff.; "Indiana politics," *ibid.*, 126 ff.

ing opponent of slavery, wrote to Chase in 1855 that the time had come to organize thoroughly the republican party. "I abhor the principles of the Know-nothings, he said, ". . . yet I think they are accomplishing a great work in breaking down the two old parties." [24] He had faith that the new party would draw largely from the foreign element and at least one-half of the know-nothings.

As the fifties wore on, say after 1854, there was relatively little interest in national legislation as a political issue except as it had a bearing on slavery, and undoubtedly nativism would have been swallowed up eventually irrespective of conditions in the Mississippi valley. But it is equally true that the republican national platform and the strategy of the presidential campaign of 1860 were molded, or at least greatly affected, by the Mississippi valley.

However difficult it may be for the student of American politics to justify the organization of the know-nothing party and to sanction the dark lantern methods of its leaders, he ought not to pass over in silence certain flagrant evils connected with immigration. Ignorant foreign suffrage, especially in the cities of the east, was a menace to healthy political development. The adopted citizens to some extent considered themselves a separate class, and their prejudices were carefully nursed by native and foreign demagogues.[25] Foreign language papers constantly urged their readers to organize in order to protect and to secure their rights.[26]

It is undoubtedly true that many priests and pastors of foreign language churches opposed the study of the English language and the adoption of the customs of the country, hoping thereby to retain their hold on the members. An important element among the German immigrants had beeen virtually exiled from their native land, but some of them came with the intention of concentrating in groups and in certain states in order to perpetuate the German language. It must also be admitted that sentiments were uttered which grated harshly on the

[24] William Salter, *The life of James W. Grimes, governor of Iowa, 1854-1858; a senator of the United States, 1859-1869* (New York, 1876), 68-71.

[25] *Brownson's quarterly review,* third series, 11:461 ff.

[26] *Der Volks-Tribun* (New York) for 1846 and other German papers show the self-consciousness of the Germans.

ears of even the most liberally inclined Americans. "Is the German idea of freedom nothing against the hypocrisy of the Methodist?" wrote an Iowa correspondent of *Minnesota Staats Zeitung* in 1858.[27] "Is our German family hearth nothing against the copartnership of the American marriage? Is our beautiful, rich language — the language of Schiller and Goethe, Lessing and Herder — nothing against the *Mischmasch* of the English language? And shall we surrender all this?"

One of the stock arguments against recent drastic immigration restriction is that the same charges made against the so-called new immigrants were levelled against the Irish and Germans in the know-nothing days. The fears in the one case having proved largely unfounded, the implication is that the present generation need feel no alarm. The present writer is disposed to bequeath that question to the future historian.

Regarding the forties and fifties, it may be safely set down that nativism was much ado about little. The immigrant and the child of the immigrant are almost as much the victims of their environment as is the child of New England. The militant, radical editor of *Minnesota Staats Zeitung* wrote in answer to his Iowa correspondent that the English language is and always will be the language of the country — in every day use, in congress, in legislatures, and in schools. German immigrants will never forget German, but can we say the same about our children? Nationality is under humanity. German culture may have influence here, but whoever expects more dreams of an Utopia. If Americans emigrated to Germany, would not the German element predominate in elections if Germany were a republic?[28] The immigrants had broad-minded leaders, like Carl Schurz, who appealed to their countrymen to Americanize themselves, to study the language, literature, and institutions of the country.[29]

The immigrants from the various political divisions of Europe had some things in common and exhibited a certain solidarity,

[27] Wilh. Kopp, "Deutsche Schulen," in *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* November 6, 1858.

[28] *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* November 6, 1858.

[29] Carl Schurz's speech at Buffalo, reported in *Buffalo* (New York) *Commercial Advertiser,* printed in *Mankato* (Minnesota) *Semi-weekly Independent,* October 29, 1860.

but there were many evidences of disharmony. While they had no use for the know-nothing party, they had their own brands of know-nothingism. For example, the editor of a Swedish paper published at Galesburg, Illinois, in an editorial on know-nothingism in 1855, wrote that "a number of champions of freedom from the revolution of 1848 have emigrated to free America, but are not satisfied here either, and agitate unceasingly for reforms and changes entirely inconsistent with the American idea of liberty . . . . These champions of liberty from the old world are usually devoid of all religion — Christianity at least — and therefore are displeased with Christian earnestness and laws, for example, sabbath observance and the like. It is galling to their idea of liberty not to be allowed to spend the Lord's day in the ale house and saloon, to play cards and to fight between times. For this reason they have joined the Catholics in demanding the abolition of a religious freedom that regulates conduct. Their words clearly indicate that only sin ought to be free. The greater number of the German papers are edited by men of this type, and have awakened hostility on the part of the native Americans and even among a goodly number of their countrymen . . . Strangely enough, Germany contributes the best as well as the worst."[30]

The Germans sometimes returned the compliments. The *Nord Stern,* a German democratic paper published at La Crosse, Wisconsin, denounced the Norwegians, whose "God is Luther," whose spiritual wants are more modest than their temporal necessities, who are content with an old Lutheran bible, whose amusements are limited to their families and countrymen, and whose stinginess is mean and contemptible.[31] The editor of *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* who seems to have ransacked his vocabulary for epithets to apply to the nativists, outknow-nothinged the know-nothings in denouncing the Catholics. "Americans," he wrote, "tear asunder the bonds between Romanism and Republicanism, while it is yet time, by a law making it impossible for a Roman Catholic to become a citizen of your Republic."[32]

[30] *Hemlandet* (Galesburg, Illinois), March 31, 1855.

[31] Printed in *Chatfield* (Minnesota) *Republican,* May 14, 1860.

[32] "Romanismus und Republikanismus," in *Minnesota Staats Zeitung,* December 25, 1858.

Aside from the political aftermath, about the only definite accomplishment of the know-nothing party was the binding together of the different racial stocks and the coöperation between otherwise antagonistic elements within the nationalities.[33]

It is conventional to refer to the provincialism of the Mississippi valley, but it is historical to say that in the two decades preceding the civil war it was the most American part of America. To be sure the west had its limitations, but it escaped much of the arrogant intolerance of the south and the self-satisfaction of New England. The west was growing. It was receptive to ideas. It had a wholesome strain of radicalism; not everything new, whether imported or domestic, was profane. If America spells opportunity, the Mississippi valley was thoroughly American.

"Certainly unity of principle is worth more to a nation than homogeneousness of race," said a converted New England missionary to Iowa in 1862. "A people heterogeneous in origin only, is like timber that is season-cracked. A people divided on any radical and common idea is like timber with a huge split running clean through . . . The Great Valley already disproves the theory that the descendants of Puritan and Cavalier, Old World men and New, can not mingle and make one. A birth census of our troops before Island Ten or Corinth would be instructive."[34]

George M. Stephenson

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis

[33] The idea of organizing the German Roman Catholic central society sprang up when the know-nothing movement threatened to curtail the constitutional rights of foreign-born citizens. The different German Catholic benevolent societies were permanently organized into one grand association in 1855. Alfred Steckel, "German Roman Catholic central society of the United States of North America," in American Catholic historical society, *Records*, 6:252-265.

[34] "Address of Rev. George F. Magoun of Lyons, Iowa," in American home missionary society, *Thirty-sixth report* (New York, 1862), 83.

THE ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE FARMERS' ALLIANCE IN MINNESOTA

Among the various rural organizations to gain prominence in the United States after the civil war none had a greater record of achievement than the national farmers' alliance, which appeared in the northwest as early as 1880 and continued active until well toward the close of the century. Through the branches which it maintained in most of the western states the northwestern alliance, as it was more appropriately called, forced from democrats and republicans alike an unwonted recognition of farmers' rights. At length, in conjunction with similar farmer societies from other sections of the country, and with the active coöperation of the forces of labor, it blossomed forth as the people's party with a national program of reform. Concerning the new party thus created and its principles not a little has already been written, but of the several labor and farmer groups from which it was formed much remains to be told.

Credit for founding the national farmers' alliance is generally conceded to a Chicago editor named Milton George, who used to advantage the columns of his paper, the *Western Rural,* in establishing a local alliance in Cook county, Illinois, and in spreading further the gospel of farmer organization. The Cook county alliance at first assumed authority to grant charters to other locals, but the growing interest in the movement soon called for a national foundation, which a convention of three hundred delegates, meeting at Chicago on October 15, 1880, undertook to create. The constitution there adopted set forth that the object of the order was "to unite the farmers of the United States for their protection against class legislation and the encroachments of concentrated capital and the tyranny of monopoly; to provide against being imposed upon by swindlers and swindling advertisements in the public prints; to oppose in their respective political parties the election of any candidate to office, State or National, who was not strongly in sympathy with

the farmers' interests, to demand that the existing political parties should nominate farmers, or those who were in sympathy with them, for all offices within the gift of the people; and to do anything in a legitimate manner that might serve to benefit the producer." Obviously the delegates felt, as one convention orator said, that the failure of the farmers "to get their fair share of the wealth they produced was owing to the neglect of their political duties." Only by united action might they hope to secure their rights.[1]

The plan of organization approved by the Chicago gathering anticipated the union of the various local chapters into state alliances, subordinate in a general way to the national alliance, but free to act as they chose on purely state matters. In accordance with this program the *Western Rural* late in 1881 invited the Minnesota locals to send delegates to Rochester, Minnesota, on December 8, 1881, where a secretary of the national alliance would meet them in an endeavor to form the desired state organization. There were then in Minnesota some eighty alliance chapters, distributed through twenty-five different counties, but the interest in the Rochester meeting was so slight that only a handful of delegates appeared at the appointed time and place. After searching in vain for the promised national agent, the "somewhat indignant" delegates finally selected state officers without his help, authorized a state lecturer to form new alliances, and adjourned.[2]

It was some time before the Minnesota order took root and grew. The second meeting of the state alliance, held at Mankato on January 4, 1883, was hardly more auspicious than the first. Only eighteen local alliances were represented at this gathering, and neither the president nor the vice-president elected at Rochester saw fit to attend. Courageous resolutions were adopted, however, mainly directed against the railroads, and well-calculated to win farmer support.[3] The third meeting, held in the summer of 1884, registered more definite progress.

[1] *Chicago Tribune,* October 15, 1880; Solon J. Buck, *The agrarian crusade* (*The chronicles of America,* vol. 45 — New Haven, 1920), 117-119.

[2] *Record and Union* (Rochester, Minnesota), December 16, 1881; *Great West* (St. Paul), February 14, 1890.

[3] *Mankato Review,* January 9, 1883.

At this time the state secretary reported the existence of 138 local chapters and a considerably increased membership. A formal constitution was adopted, which sought to encourage growth by providing among other things that the state lecturer and his deputies might keep as their reward fifteen cents of the twenty-five cents dues to be collected from each charter member they obtained. And the determination of the alliance to seek reforms by way of the ballot-box and the legislature was vigorously affirmed.[4]

When the fourth annual meeting of the alliance was held in St. Paul on February 4, 1885, the order was a definite factor to be reckoned with in the politics of the state. It was not without significance that the meeting took place during a session of the state legislature, and that the place of meeting was the state capital. Disclaiming any desire to become a political party, or even to join hands with any existing party, alliance men yet freely admitted that their order was in a sense political, for they believed that the remedy for the ills from which they suffered was to be obtained only "by recourse to the instrumentalities of government." The inevitable resolutions urged the election of men to the legislature who favored "the enactment of equal and just laws for all interests and all subjects." Clearly the farmers believed that by the enactment of laws they could put an end to existing discriminations against them.[5]

The condition of the farming interests of the state was indeed critical. Harvests of surpassing abundance, grown upon the cheapest of land, failed none the less to bring to the farmer more than the most meager profit, if indeed he received any profit at all. The root of the evil was the low price of wheat. Outside the United States, particularly in Russia and in the Argentine, wheat was being produced in larger and larger quantities, while within the United States itself the expansion of population into the northwest had enormously increased the area of wheat-growing lands. The population of Minnesota, for example, grew from 597,407 in 1875 to 1,117,798 in 1885, nearly doubling in the ten years; and while a large proportion of this increase went to the rapidly growing twin cities, the number of

[4] *Ibid.*, June 17, 1884; *Great West*, February 14, 1890.

[5] *Pioneer Press* (St. Paul), February 6, 1885.

new farms opened up was nevertheless large.[6] They contributed their share towards what amounted practically to an oversupply of wheat in the markets of the world, and therefore towards an inevitable decline in the price it would bring. The average amount per bushel received by the Minnesota wheat grower for his crop in 1884 was estimated by the state railway commissioner at from forty-two to forty-eight cents. It was generally agreed that the cost of raising a bushel of wheat was not less than forty-five cents — government experts said from fifty to sixty-seven cents.[7] "The result," according to a committee of the Minneapolis board of trade, "is general dissatisfaction and complaint throughout the great wheat belt of the northwest, and in many of the newer portions, impoverishment, bankruptcy, and general distress. Trade is stagnant, the farmers are despondent, and financial disaster and ruin are taking the place of the business prosperity, agricultural thrift and the general buoyancy which pervaded those regions only a short time since." The complaints advanced in such abundance and with such earnestness could not have been, apparently, the "mere mutterings of malcontents." They were truly enough the representations of men "brought face to face with probable ruin."[8]

That the farmers had themselves to thank for some of their distress is probably true. Many of them, with more optimism than capital, had gone so deeply into debt for their farm mach-

[6] *Legislative manual of the state of Minnesota. Compiled for the legislature of 1891* (St. Paul, 1891), 300-301.

[7] *Annual report of the railway commissioner of Minnesota, to the governor, for the year ending June 30, 1884* (St. Paul, 1885), 21. Wheat prices of the best grades in St. Paul (December) were quoted as follows, 1858-1884:

1858.....$ .80	1867.....$1.40	1876.....$1.15
1859..... .60	1868..... .95	1877..... 1.00
1860..... .50	1869..... .75	1878..... .78
1861..... .68	1870..... .85	1879..... 1.18
1862..... .90	1871..... 1.10	1880..... .88
1863..... 1.15	1872..... .85	1881..... 1.23
1864..... .90	1873..... .95	1882..... .93
1865..... .90	1874..... .82	1883..... 1.00
1866..... 1.60	1875..... .95	1884..... .76

It will be observed that in 1884 the price of wheat reached the lowest level since 1869, and that only five times in 27 years had it been lower than 76 cents. See *Pioneer Press*, January 28, 1885. Local wheat prices would be substantially the St. Paul price less transportation to St. Paul, elevator charges, and the like.

[8] *Pioneer Press*, February 2, 1884, January 27, 1885.

inery and improvements that only the most liberal prices and the most favorable seasons could have saved them. Others, eager "to get rich in a year or two," had undertaken to farm more land than they could reasonably hope to give adequate attention.[9] Practically all of them depended mainly for their living upon the raising of wheat and small grain. The wheat crop from seeding time to harvest occupied at best but four and a half months, and during the rest of the year far too many farmers were without remunerative employment. James J. Hill, the railway builder, never lost an opportunity to point out to the people of the northwest the perils of the one-crop system, and the necessity of diversified agriculture. "There is not one farmer in five in the northern part of the state," he complained, "who raises his own meat or makes his own butter." What the farmer needed, according to a less friendly critic than Hill, was to raise "more pigs" and "less politics."[10]

While the farmers' shortcomings and the low price of wheat account in large part for the agrarian discontent in the northwest during the middle eighties, there were undoubtedly other important factors which entered into the situation. Farmers did not as a rule complain about the low price of wheat in the world market. What they did complain of was the fact that they received so much less than this price. When wheat sold for eighty-five cents a bushel in New York, the Minnesota farmer was fortunate indeed if he received fifty cents a bushel for his crop at the local elevator. The thirty-five cents difference between these two figures represented the cost of transportation, elevator charges, and so forth, fees paid not to the producer, but to railways, warehouse companies, commission merchants and the like. The farmer claimed that if he could only get his fair share of the price for which his grain eventually sold he would be prosperous enough. "How long," he queried, "even with these cheap and wonderfully productive lands, can . . . any agricultural community pay such enormous tribute to corporate organization in times like these, without final exhaustion?"[11]

"Corporate organization" meant to the Minnesota farmer

[9] *Ibid.*, January 19, 1884.

[10] *Pioneer Press,* January 12, 19, 1884; James G. Pyle, *The Life of James J. Hill* (New York, 1917), 1:362.

[11] *Pioneer Press,* January 27, 1885.

primarily the railway companies. After the panic of 1873 railway building in the state was so arrested that for four years together less than a hundred miles of new roadbed were completed, but beginning with 1877 construction went forward rapidly. By the end of that year Minnesota roads claimed over two thousand miles of trackage; by 1880 they had passed the three thousand figure; and by 1884 practically four thousand miles were in use. The state railway commissioner noted also the "striking fact" of railway consolidation. While admitting cheerfully the administration of his office in a way "to encourage the further investment of capital in railways in this state," he expressed mild astonishment that the process of consolidation had gone so far. "The number of separate railroad companies operating distinct roads in Minnesota was as high as twenty, three years ago," he said. "Now, the number is reduced substantially to about one-third that number." He might have added with equal truthfulness that so far as local hauls were concerned competition had ceased to exist, if indeed it ever did exist. Most of the new roads were built into undeveloped regions where from the first they had a complete monopoly of the business, but if perchance a "parallel and competing" line appeared on the scene "it would be discovered some fine morning that enough of its stock had been purchased by the older lines to give them control." [12]

Thus fortified by monopoly, the railroads, according to the farmers, collected in excessive rates enough to make the difference between prosperity and ruin for the grain-grower. "From many points in the State," wrote Governor Hubbard in his annual message to the legislature in 1885, "one-half the value of a bushel of wheat is taken for its transportation to Chicago, while from remote stations the freight and accompanying charges upon certain kinds and grades of grain, amount almost to a confiscation." [13] Most of this toll, moreover, was taken by the local roads. For example, the rates from Fargo to Duluth were near-

[12] *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1881, pp. 4-5; *Pioneer Press,* January 31, 1884.

[13] *Biennial message of Governor L. F. Hubbard to the legislature of Minnesota, delivered January 7, 1885. Printed by authority* (St. Paul, 1885), 42-43. Printed also in *Pioneer Press,* January 8, 1885.

ly double those from Minneapolis to Chicago — a distance twice as great. It cost as much as twenty-five cents a bushel freight to get grain from many Minnesota stations to St. Paul or Minneapolis, when for only a few cents more it could be transported all the way to the seaboard. Indeed, evidence was at hand to show that wheat could actually be sent from Chicago to Liverpool for less than from the northwestern part of Minnesota to the twin cities. As the price of wheat declined, these high local freights seemed to the farmer more and more unreasonable. Costs of nearly everything else were less than they had been a few years before, but freight rates remained practically the same as when wheat had brought half again as much. It looked as if the principle of "charging all the traffic would bear" was being pushed to the limit.[14]

The railroads never failed to make a showing in their own defence. They pointed out that the high local rates were justified because the traffic of the northwest was nearly all in one direction. During one season of the year for every car of wheat hauled out an empty car had to be hauled in, while the rest of the time about ninety per cent of the traffic went from Chicago to the northwest. They asserted that the new roads were often in territory sparsely settled and operated at a loss even with the highest of rates. James J. Hill maintained that the roads were reducing rates as fast as they could, and to prove it he even declared himself "willing that the state make any rates it see fit," provided the state would "guarantee the roads 6% on their actual cost and a fund for maintenance, renewal and other necessary expenditures." But the farmers had little use for such arguments. They believed that the roads took advantage of the well-nigh absolute dependence of the northwest upon them for contact with the outside world; that they built feeders into sparsely settled regions, often in advance of immigration, only to preëmpt the field for future expansion; that they demanded from farmers living in civilization rates high enough not only to pay interest upon these speculative investments, but also to pay interest on watered capital stock never invested at all.[15]

[14] *Ibid.*, January 26, 1884, January 27, 1885; *Annual report of the railway commissioner*, 1884, p. 21.

[15] *Pioneer Press*, January 3, 27, 29, 31, February 3, 7, 1885.

Some Minnesota roads made their reputations even worse than was generally the case by charging "transit" or through rates on all the wheat they carried. Companies making use of this device were selfishly determined to get every dollar of revenue they could from their customers. They demanded that the wheat shipper pay in advance the full rate to Chicago or Milwaukee, or whatever city happened to be their easternmost terminal. They refused entirely to quote local rates to Minneapolis or St. Paul, fearing that if they did so the grain might be transferred at those points to some other road. It was well understood, however, that the shipper who paid "transit" rates might unload his grain at any milling center, or at any mill on the route, have it ground, and then ship it out again as flour, on the same rate contract. And if he disposed of his grain finally at such a point, he might sell the balance of his unused freight for what it would bring.

Suppose, for example, that a grain dealer at Milbank, Dakota, just across the western border of Minnesota, wished to sell his wheat in Minneapolis. According to the rules of the Hastings and Dakota road, over which he must ship, he was not allowed to pay local freight to Minneapolis, but he was compelled to pay full "transit" rates to Milwaukee — forty cents a hundred pounds instead of the twenty cents a hundred which should normally have been charged. After disposing of his wheat in Minneapolis the dealer still had on his hands a quantity of unexpended freight from Minneapolis to Milwaukee, for which he had paid approximately twenty cents a hundred. This he offered for sale on the open market, but because "transit," as the unused freight was called, was too plentiful, and sold only at a discount of from two and one half to five cents per hundred pounds, the Milbank shipper was fortunate to get fifteen cents, or a little more depending on the market, for transportation which had cost him twenty cents. This loss he learned to look upon as inevitable, and as inevitably he protected himself liberally against it in advance by lowering the price paid the farmer for his grain. "Transit wheat," that is, wheat which had to be shipped over roads quoting transit rates only, always brought from three to five cents a bushel less than "free wheat."

Small wonder that farmers living in "transit" regions felt themselves to be defrauded of their rightful profits! There is "probably in no other portion of this country," commented the conservative *Pioneer Press,* "any class of people subjected to such miserable oppression, exercised by a power to which there is no resistence to be offered, and from whose dominion there is no escape. . . . Those who would submit quietly to such outrage must be either more or less than men." [16]

Nor was the charging of excessive and unreasonable rates the only railway grievance of which the farmers complained. They asserted that the transportation companies discriminated definitely against the small shipper, and in favor of his larger competitors. The local grain merchant without elevator facilities, or the farmer desiring to ship his own grain, invariably had greater and graver difficulties with the roads than did the large elevator companies. These latter, the farmers contended, were favored by "inside rates," by rebates, and by preferential treatment with regard to cars. Secret rate understandings between the railroads and the elevator companies were hard to prove, but discrimination with respect to cars was open and notorious. "Parties desiring to ship grain, whether producers or purchasers," ran a regulation in force on the Hill system, "where there is an elevator, must ship through it, or construct an elevator of at least 30,000 bushels capacity, or cars will not be furnished." No doubt, as Governor Hubbard pointed out, the railroads found it a matter of "economy, profit, and convenience" to receive "large, frequent and easily regulated shipments under contracts with a smaller number of shippers" rather than to bother with small and irregular shipments from many different sources. But this could not be regarded as a sufficient apology for the failure of supposedly common carriers to give equal treatment to all those who desired to use their lines. "The railways cannot have a choice of customers," declared the impotent railway commissioner. "Railways, like inn-keepers, must take all that come till the quarters are full. If it is an inconvenience to furnish cars to flat-houses or merchants, the answer

[16] The subject of "transit" rates is fully discussed in the *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1884, p. 23; and in the *Pioneer Press,* January 26, 1884.

is, that is just what the railways are paid for; to serve the public generally is their proper function.'' [17]

Closely connected with the problem of the railroads was that of the elevators. Some grain houses were owned by individuals or local companies who ran one or more elevators in neighboring towns. A few were owned by the railway companies themselves. Still others were the property of large corporations which operated a whole string of elevators up and down the entire length of a railway line. These larger companies, whose capital was usually subscribed in part at least by the Minneapolis millers, naturally built better and more commodious houses than the smaller companies; they were more efficient in their manner of doing business; and they were easily the favorites of the railroads. All the companies, large or small, must obtain on whatever terms the railway companies saw fit to impose such special privileges as the right to build upon railroad land, and the right to proper sidetrack facilities. By refusing these favors the roads could prevent, and did prevent, the erection of new elevators where they deemed the old ones adequate, but once an elevator was authorized it could usually count on railway support.[18]

Thanks mainly to their satisfactory relations with the railroads, the first elevator companies to cover a territory enjoyed in their respective localities almost a complete monopoly of the grain business, both buying and selling. Wherever elevators existed the roads virtually required that shipments of grain be made through them, for in practice if not in theory cars were seldom furnished to those who wished to avoid the elevator, and to load their grain from wagons or from flat warehouses. On the face of it this rule seemed harmless enough, for the elevator

[17] *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1883, pp. 15-19; *Biennial message of Governor Hubbard, delivered January 7, 1885,* 40; *Pioneer Press,* January 8, 1885. An eastern railway president wrote to Ignatius Donnelly: ''One of these days the people of the Northwest will seize on the railroads and run them. And they will be right. At the East we have consciences. But I never saw such insoucient services to the chartering party charged for at as lofty a rate as by three or four roads that run into St. Paul.'' Appleton Morgan to Donnelly, November 25, 1886, in the Donnelly papers, in the possession of the Minnesota historical society.

[18] *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1884, pp. 17-20; *Annual report of the railroad and warehouse commission of Minnesota to the governor. For the year ending November 30, 1889* (Minneapolis, 1890), 13-14.

companies were supposedly under obligations to serve the general public, and to ship grain for all comers on equal terms. This they might have done with fair impartiality had they not been engaged themselves in the buying and selling of grain. But since it was the chief concern of the elevator operator to purchase and ship all the grain he could get, he could hardly be expected to take much interest in providing facilities for the farmer who wished to ship directly, or for the competitive grain merchant who lacked an elevator of his own. The result was that the independent buyer was speedily "frozen out," and the farmer found that if he was to get rid of his grain at all he must sell to the local elevator for whatever price he was offered. He claimed rightly that under such a system he was denied a "free market" for his grain. To all except the privileged elevator companies the market was closed.[19]

This absence of a free market was the chief reason assigned by the farmers for the low prices they were paid for their grain. Since the elevator men had a monopoly of the grain buying business, what was to prevent them from paying only such a figure as their pleasure and interests might dictate? If there was only one elevator at a station it was clear that the operator was a law unto himself, and might pay what he chose. Even if there were several elevators there was only rarely competition as to price. Pooling was sometimes resorted to, but usually agreements with regard to prices could be reached without this device, each elevator taking its share of grain without attempting to capture the business of its neighbor.[20]

When the elevator companies paid lower prices than were justifiable, they naturally made an effort to conceal the fact. They knew that the price of wheat in Minneapolis or Chicago at any given time was public information. The railway rates to such a terminal were also known to all. If, therefore, they openly exacted more than a reasonable profit for handling grain their practice would be subjected to an unpleasant and "pitiless" publicity. So they generally quoted as good prices as could be reasonably expected, considering the high freight they had to pay,

[19] *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1883, p. 19; *ibid.,* 1884, pp. 19-20; *Pioneer Press,* January 19, 1884.

[20] *Pioneer Press,* January 12, 19, 1884.

and the current market values of wheat at the terminals to which they shipped. For their long profits they relied upon more skilful means. Wheat, as presented for sale, was of course of uneven quality, and must be graded before a price could be assigned. Custom had established certain standards of grading; for example, wheat ranked as number one hard must weigh fifty-eight pounds or more to the bushel, must be clean, of a good color, and at least ninety per cent pure hard wheat. Grain which was too light in weight, or which contained foul seed, and was dirty, off-color, or frosted was graded accordingly. It was in determining these grades that the elevator men had the best opportunity to reduce the price paid to the farmer, for the buyer fixed the grades at will after making such an examination of the wheat as he saw fit. The farmer had nothing to say about it. If he objected to the grade and price he was offered he had no recourse but to take his grain to another elevator, probably only to find that there the same condition prevailed. Nor was another elevator always available.

Undoubtedly there was great irregularity and unfairness about the grading of grain. Farmers at one station claimed that they had never received a grade of number one hard, and very little if any number one regular. They therefore appointed a committee of three to follow a shipment of thirty cars from their town to Duluth, where they found that four of the cars had been graded number one hard, ten number one regular, and nearly all above the grades the farmers received. The local elevator had profited accordingly. It was alleged in another community that wheat from the same field, grown from the same seed, and harvested at the same time, had been graded some number one, some number two, and some rejected. At best the elevator operators were anxious to grade low enough to protect themselves against losses. Charles A. Pillsbury, one of the most prominent elevator men in the state, himself admitted that at the beginning of the crop season, grades at Minneapolis and Duluth were much more liberal than later when the supply was greater and the demand had diminished. Often enough, elevator operators in the early part of the season graded according to their honest judgment, but later on when inspection at the terminal points had tightened up, they became frightened and

refused "for days at a time to grade anything above number two hard, no matter what the quality offered." The state railway commissioner estimated conservatively, he believed, that the farmer lost on an average about five cents a bushel through unfair grading. Many said twice that amount.[21]

These in a general way were the practices of the elevator companies and of the railways to which the Minnesota farmers objected. The state railway commissioner in his report for 1884 commented on the fact that his office was deluged with complaints about "transportation rates, transit rates, discriminations, facilities for shipping grain and matters of kindred character . . . intermingled with others as to the arbitrary method of the grading of wheat." These evils he was helpless to correct, for, as a farmers' alliance speaker at Mankato bluntly phrased it, he had "no authority to *do* anything." "The railway code of Minnesota," declared the commissioner himself, "is undoubtedly the most meager and defective of any of the northern States. The legislative action of 1871 was carried to such an extreme that in the reaction the people of the State naturally feared to reopen the subject . . . . New questions and new difficulties have constantly presented themselves . . . which are wholly beyond means of redress under existing statutes." Nor were laws to correct elevator abuses any less conspicuously wanting.[22]

It was the determination of the farmers' alliance to see that this missing authority was supplied. Thanks to the granger decisions, which established the principle that a state might regulate businesses of a public nature,[23] it was assumed that there could be no question as to the constitutionality of such procedure. Nor was there any denying the moral right of a people to exercise a wide measure of control over railroads built by land grant assistance, and over an elevator system authorized by these roads. It was claimed by alliance leaders that for each mile of track constructed in Minnesota more than $20,000 had been expended by the public in gifts of land, not to mention

[21] *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1883, pp. 12-15; *Appleton's annual cyclopaedia,* 1882, p. 560; *Pioneer Press,* January 19, 1884.

[22] *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1884, pp. 9-11; *Mankato Review,* June 17, 1884.

[23] Solon J. Buck, *The granger movement* (Cambridge, 1913), 206.

other assistance received by the roads from counties, townships, and municipalities. "We, the people," argued one lecturer, "have given them thousands and thousands of acres of land .... Under these circumstances it is ... just and right that we should have something to say about their management."[24] As a means to this end the alliance organization used its influence to put men in the state legislature who could be trusted to carry out the farmers' program of reform. So successful was this movement that, when the session of 1885 opened, the house was conceded to be "pretty much granger," and the conservative senate faced the grave duty of keeping in check a sturdy company of "fresh and self-conscious" country members.[25]

So insistent was the demand of the farmers for relief that from the opening days of the session it was evident that both a railway and an elevator bill would be passed, even though neither could be expected to go as far as the farmers desired. Hoping to obtain an "open market free from all discriminations by railroads, and ... wheat transportation ... at the lowest possible rate,"[26] the alliance men generally favored the creation of an elective railway and warehouse commission of three members, which should have the most extensive powers of "inspection, supervision, inquisition, and prosecution," including the right to enforce the "long and short haul" principle, and wherever it was deemed necessary, to fix and maintain maximum rates. As for the elevator monopoly, some stringent system of state inspection and control must be devised. To the alliance demands the railway and the elevator companies were by no means prepared to yield. Railroad men, led by James J. Hill, fought valiantly against any control by the state in the matter of making rates, and elevator owners under Senator

[24] *Pioneer Press,* February 7, 1885. The state railway commissioner furnished these statistics:

Congressional grants	12,151,527 acres
Swamp lands	1,811,750 acres
Total	13,963,277 acres

This meant 4,259 acres of land for every mile of railway in the state, worth $21,295 if valued at $5 per acre. *Annual report of the railway commissioner,* 1882, p. 37.

[25] *Pioneer Press,* January 5, February 11, 1885; W. Muzzy to Donnelly, December 7, 1886, Donnelly papers.

[26] *Mankato Review,* June 17, 1884.

Charles A. Pillsbury even threatened to convert their public elevators into private grain houses if their activities were too closely circumscribed. Since the state senate proved to be more keenly sensitive to the wishes of the corporations than to the wishes of the farmers' alliance, the advocates of radical measures sustained frequent disappointments. House bills reflected fairly accurately the desires of the farmers; senate bills received the hearty sanction of the interests to be regulated; and the compromise measures finally passed yielded something to each side.[27]

Disappointing as in some respects it was, the legislation enacted registered definite progress for the farmers. Every railway company in the state was required to permit any person, company, or corporation for one dollar a year rental to construct and operate an elevator or warehouse of any desired size at a regular railway station, and upon or along the right of way. It was thought that this provision would create a free market by encouraging the building of many country elevators, whose activities would be regulated by close competition. A railway company must also provide reasonable sidetrack facilities for all grain houses; it must furnish cars to elevators, warehouses, and those desiring to ship from sidetracks without any discrimination whatsoever; and it must forward the grain to the point indicated by the shipper, "or in the direction thereof," with reasonable dispatch and at reasonable rates. A railroad and warehouse commission of three members, to be appointed by the governor, was authorized to enforce these regulations by negotiations with the companies if it could, and by prosecution in the courts if it must.[28] The "long and short haul" clause, which was included in the house bill, was eliminated by the senate, as was also the right of the commission to fix maximum rates. The grain bill, which dealt with the elevators, ordered the same commission to establish grain grades, and to devise machinery for the grading and weighing by state inspectors of all grain handled at the terminal points — St. Paul,

[27] The debates on these bills are given in part in the *Pioneer Press*, January-February, 1885. See especially January 30, February 5, 13.

[28] *General laws of the state of Minnesota passed during the twenty-fourth session of the state legislature* (St. Paul, 1885), 243-253.

Minneapolis, and Duluth. All elevators in these cities were declared to be public grain houses, and were required to procure licenses before doing business.[29] The great number and variety of the country elevators made it seem out of the question to try to inspect grain buying everywhere, and furthermore it was maintained that "if a fair, equitable and uniform system of inspection could be established at the *terminal* points, upon which the country buyer could depend with a reasonable degree of assurance, he in turn would establish his grades in conformity thereto, and thus the producer who was compelled to market his grain at the local station, would secure indirectly the benefits of the new system."[30]

The railroad and warehouse commission, created by the legislation of 1885, acquitted itself creditably considering the handicaps under which it worked. It scored its greatest success, perhaps, when it put into effect at the terminal points mentioned in the law uniform grades in wheat and other grain, and a uniform system of weighing. From the railways it forced a reluctant consent to the total abolition of "transit" rates, except as they existed in purely optional form, and to a state-wide three-cent passenger fare.[31] Its efforts to maintain a free and open grain market, by enforcing the right of every person for one dollar a year rental to erect a warehouse upon railway land, were doomed, however, to quick disappointment. The state supreme court held on the first test case that this procedure was unconstitutional, since it authorized the taking of private property without adequate compensation, and without the consent of the owners.[32] In many other ways the commission found its work seriously hampered. If the railways chose to obey its orders, all went well enough; but if not, the only course open was to institute judicial proceedings, and pending the outcome of litigation — a matter of months and years — the roads invariably did as they pleased. To be fully effective, the commission needed the right to make and to enforce such rates and such regulations as it deemed advisable.[33]

[29] *General laws of the state of Minnesota,* 136-148.

[30] *Annual report of the railroad and warehouse commission,* 1890, part 1, pp. 7-8.

[31] *Ibid.,* 1885, p. 11; 1886, pp. 9, 11, 45; 1888, pp. 10-11.

[32] *Ibid.,* 1886, pp. 14-15; 36 Minnesota, 402.

[33] A bill giving it the desired authority was submitted by the commission to the legislature of 1887, and is printed in the *Annual report,* 1887, pp. 163-201.

There remained therefore many battles for the farmers' alliance yet to win, and early in 1886 another mobilization of farmer forces began. Following the annual February convention of the alliance, at which the usual resolutions were adopted with unusual enthusiasm,[34] the state executive committee met in conference at St. Paul to lay plans for the fall campaign. Their intentions were boldly announced in a circular letter to the rank and file: "We do not desire to organize a political party," it ran. "We hope that one party or the other will present a set of candidates that we can endorse." At another alliance gathering, held on September 1, it was decided to sound out the older parties on platforms as well as candidates, and committees were authorized to present to each convention the farmers' demands.[35] So impressed were democrats and republicans alike with this threatening attitude that they both made haste to compromise with it. The republicans turned down the candidate for governor most favored by alliance leaders, but they received the alliance committee with every show of respect, and they adopted resolutions even more radical than the farmers urged.[36] The democrats gave slight consideration to the visiting committee, for whose spokesman, Ignatius Donnelly, they had small regard, but they adopted a liberal platform, and they nominated a candidate at the head of their ticket who was known to be strongly favorable to the farmers' cause.[37] Under the circumstances the alliance stood a fair chance to get some of its views translated into law whichever party won the election; but the leaders, with Donnelly dissenting, decided to throw the farmer vote to the democrats. They succeeded to a remarkable degree, for the republican ticket won by a margin of but 3,400 votes instead of many times that number as would normally have been the case. Had Donnelly coöperated it is probably true, as he claimed, that he "could have carried the state for the democratic candidate for governor by 10,000 majority." In

[34] The platform is printed in the *Pioneer Press,* February 25, 1886.

[35] *Ibid.,* May 27, June 5, September 2, 1886.

[36] *A history of the republican party from its organization to the present time, to which is added a political history of Minnesota from a republican point of view and biographical sketches of leading Minnesota republicans,* published by Eugene V. Smalley (St. Paul, 1896), 223. The platform adopted is given in full in the *Pioneer Press,* September 26, 1886.

[37] *Ibid.,* September 15, 1886.

the congressional contests of the year the independent voting was so great that for the first time since the civil war a democratic delegation was sent to congress — three democrats to two republicans. As for the legislature it seemed certain that men of alliance principles would control both houses.[38]

Among those elected to the legislature in 1886 was the quixotic Donnelly himself, who now stepped forward uninvited to lead the farmers' cause. He warned Governor-elect McGill that the new administration must "take advanced and positive ground in favor of the chief measures enunciated in the Republican state platform . . . If this is not done and the Legislature does not sustain you, the Democracy will sweep the state in 1888." Donnelly only spoke the minds of the Republican leaders, who were already badly frightened at the prospect of losing their hold on the state. They therefore interposed few obstacles in the way of the success of the alliance reforms. When the legislature met, they permitted Donnelly to obtain the most important committee appointments in the house of representatives, and in general they gave the alliance men a free rein — one might better say, all the rope they wanted.[39]

While the legislature was in session the farmers' alliance met in annual convention and stated its terms anew. The platform adopted called for an intricate system of state inspection of the country elevators, new and more stringent grain and warehouse legislation, reduction of the legal rate of interest from ten per cent to eight per cent, a constitutional amendment declaring all combinations which interfered with the freedom of the food markets of the state to be criminal conspiracies, and another giving to the legislature or such officers as it might designate the right to make or alter railway fares at will, to establish the long and short haul principle, and in various ways to regulate the railroads. These were the measures which Donnelly and his colleagues hoped to push through.[40]

They were doomed to bitter disappointment. The oppor-

[38] Donnelly to Lucius Q. C. Lamar, January 1, 1887, Donnelly papers; Smalley, *History of the republican party,* 224-225.

[39] Donnelly to McGill, November 8, 1886, Donnelly papers; John D. Hicks, "The political career of Ignatius Donnelly," in Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 8:107-108.

[40] *Pioneer Press,* February 3, 5, 1887.

tunity to exert authority was too much for Donnelly, who conducted himself "like a bull in a china shop," and speedily lost the support of many whose views accorded with his. "We had to sit down on Donnelly in order to get any legislation this term," said one of his colleagues. "He got the idea no bill could pass the House without his O. K." To dissension among the reformers was added the active lobbying of the interested corporations, who whittled down the farmer majority in the house, and virtually abolished it in the senate. The grain bills, the usury bill, and the railway amendment failed one after another, as did many minor measures dear to the farmers' hearts.[41] The food monopoly amendment was passed, and was finally adopted at the polls, but it was mostly rhetoric.[42] About the only measure of importance to become law was a general revision of the railroad and warehouse commission act of 1885.

There was much that was comforting to alliance men about this law. It enlarged the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the commission, added provisions to prevent rebates and pooling, required that charges should be "equal and reasonable," and no higher "for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line," forbade hindrances to through transportation over whatever route the shipper desired to use, and insisted on ample facilities for all localities without discrimination. Moreover the law came very close to giving the commission full rate-making authority. It provided that in case any part of the published tariffs of rates, fares, charges, or classifications should be found by the commission to be unequal and unreasonable, the commission should have the power "to compel any common carrier to change the same and adopt such rate, fare, charge, or classification as said commission shall

[41] A. H. Baker to —— Lightbourn, February 22, 1887, Donnelly papers; Harlan P. Hall, *Observations; being more or less a history of political contests in Minnesota from 1849 to 1904* (St. Paul, 1904), 224; *Labor Echo* (St. Paul), October 20, 1888. The fate of the various alliance measures may also be ascertained from the journals of the house and senate: *Journal of the house of the twenty-fifth session of the legislature of the state of Minnesota* (St. Paul, 1887), 437, 609; *Journal of the senate of the twenty-fifth session of the legislature of the state of Minnesota* (St. Paul, 1887), 511, 514, 603, 700, 963.

[42] William Anderson, *A history of the constitution of Minnesota with the first verified text* (*University of Minnesota studies in the social sciences,* no. 15 — Minneapolis, 1921), 221.

declare to be equal and reasonable." It was assumed that the decision of the commission as to what was "equal and reasonable" would be final and conclusive.[43]

Compulsion, however, was possible only through the courts, and from the first the roads resisted as unconstitutional the rate-making features of the law. To test its authority the commission finally applied to the state supreme court for a writ of mandamus to compel the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul railway company to comply with the recommendation of the commission to change its tariff rates on milk from the cities of Owatonna and Faribault to St. Paul and Minneapolis. The state court favored the commission, ruling that the "decision was full and conclusive, with reference to the powers of the commission, the constitutionality of the act creating it, and the jurisdiction of the supreme court of the state." But on appeal to the United States supreme court this decision was reversed. The higher tribunal held that, because the law did not provide for a judicial inquiry as to the reasonableness of the rates fixed by the commission, it was in conflict with the constitution of the United States "as depriving the company of its property without due process of law, and depriving it of the equal protection of the laws." Thus the most important provision of the law was eliminated.[44]

Alliance men were considerably crestfallen over their lack of success with the legislature of 1887, but not all of them realized that their own dissensions were at least partly responsible for the situation. One of their number came very close to the truth when he asserted that if one-tenth of the farmers of Minnesota "should unite and demand what they want, they might get it, but if they were all agreed and would not pull together they could do nothing."[45] In the campaign of 1888 they were not yet ready to "pull together." A very few, who favored the formation of a third party, joined with organized

[43] *General laws of the state of Minnesota,* 1887, pp. 49-66.

[44] *Annual report of the railroad and warehouse commission,* 1888, pp. 29, 123-133; 38 Minnesota, 281; 134 United States, 418. The law was brought into conformity with the decision of the United States supreme court by an act of 1891, which nevertheless preserved all other powers granted to the commission by the law of 1887. *General laws of the state of Minnesota,* 1891, pp. 178-185.

[45] *Pioneer Press,* February 2, 1888.

labor leaders to name a farm and labor ticket, but their candidates declined nomination, and even before the day of election their party had disappeared. Others, led by Donnelly, favored coöperation with the republicans, whose candidate for governor proclaimed loudly his sympathy for the farmers. Still others hoped for reform through democratic victory. With the farmer vote thus divided the election was more nearly normal than it had been for years, and the legislature which resulted showed little disposition to take up radical legislation. To be sure, it did put a modified Australian ballot law on the statute books, and it made an appropriation of $100,000 to help farmers whose crops had been destroyed by hail, frost, or blight to buy seed grain, but the more pressing demands of the alliance were ignored. With Donnelly absent — he had been defeated for reelection — many of them were not even given an airing.[46]

It was now perfectly clear that the alliance needed new members and a new policy if it were to succeed. The new members came easily. Early in 1889 Donnelly became state lecturer, and with an able force of deputies he undertook to spread the alliance gospel to every corner of the state. A weekly newspaper, the *Great West,* edited in St. Paul, assisted materially in the good work. Farmers were as ready as ever to be impressed by reform propaganda, for the price of wheat was still low,[47] freight rates and elevator profits had not been greatly reduced, and mortgages remained well-nigh universal. Thanks mainly to systematic cultivation of the field, the number of local alliances and of affiliated members grew by leaps and bounds. With the increase in membership the policy of the alliance began likewise to undergo a change. Heretofore it had been generally understood that the organization had no thought of becoming a political party. Now, members asked, why should the alliance hesitate longer about going into politics? It had

[46] Smalley, *History of the republican party,* 226-230, gives the history of the campaign of 1888. The legislation of 1889 is reviewed briefly in *Appleton's annual cyclopaedia,* 1889, pp. 561-563. The election law is in *General laws of the state of Minnesota,* 1889, pp. 12-40. It was further amended by subsequent legislatures. *Ibid.,* 1891, pp. 23-67; *ibid.,* 1893, pp. 16-78. The seed grain law may be found *ibid.,* 1889, pp. 41-46. It was by no means unprecedented.

[47] Prices in St. Paul were quoted in the *Pioneer Press* as from seventy-five cents to eighty-five cents in January, 1888, and a little under one dollar in January, 1889.

tried repeatedly to gain ground by use of the older parties, and had always fallen far short of its objectives. Why should it not strike out for itself?[48]

The history of the alliance movement in Minnesota from this time on need not be repeated here. For the sake of completeness, however, a little ought to be said about subsequent legislation in which attempts were made to realize alliance ambitions. One rather futile law passed in 1891 subjected to heavy fine all those who were responsible for the formation of pools, trusts, combinations, or agreements to regulate or fix the price of oil, lumber, coal, grain, flour, provisions, or "any other commodity or article whatever." In 1893 an amendment added to the punishment by fine a penitentiary sentence of from one to ten years.[49] Another ill-starred statute provided for the erection at Duluth of a state terminal elevator of 1,500,000 bushels capacity for the public storage of grain. It was expected that this elevator would secure to the farmers of the northern part of the state the opportunity to ship their grain to a primary market instead of selling it to the elevators at country railroad stations, as they were virtually compelled to do. But the elevator was never built. The appropriation for the purpose was made incorrectly from a practically nonexistent grain and warehouse fund, instead of from the general fund, and the attorney-general ruled that there was no way to make the money available. The state supreme court later held that the entire law was in violation of article 9, section 5, of the constitution of Minnesota, which forbids the state to "contract any debts for works of internal improvements, or be a party in carrying on such works."[50] More successful was the long-delayed country elevator law. Terminal elevators had been subject to state regulation and inspection since 1885, but the country elevators were still free from public control, and could declare whatever grades they chose. Official inspection under the old law could be obtained only by loading and consigning grain to the terminal

[48] Smalley, *History of the republican party*, 232-236; *Appleton's annual cyclopaedia*, 1890, pp. 299, 556-557; *Legislative manual of the state of Minnesota*, 1891, pp. 485-492.

[49] *General laws of the state of Minnesota*, 1891, pp. 82-83; *ibid.*, 1893, p. 251.

[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 140-143; *Annual report of the railroad and warehouse commission*, 1893, pp. 8-20; 56 Minnesota, 100.

points — a difficult process for the small shipper. A law of 1893 subjected all elevators and warehouses engaged in the business of receiving, storing, and shipping grain to regulation by the state railroad and warehouse commission, and required them to take out licenses as public elevators. Local inspectors were not provided, however, as in the case of the terminal elevators, but disputes and disagreements as to grade, arising between the country buyer and seller, could be referred to the chief inspector of the state, who must then determine the quality or grade of the grain from samples submitted to him. The law provided also that the operators of country elevators should issue negotiable warehouse receipts, which the holder might sell wherever and to whomsoever he chose. These provisions did much to insure fair treatment to the farmer at the local stations.[51]

The farmers' alliance in its lifetime really accomplished a great deal, but it failed certainly to bring on an agricultural millenium. At least one reason for the continued lack of prosperity of the farmers was pointed out by the New York *Nation* when it insisted that the rural classes were "*a priori* 'unprotected,' the victims of a system of free-trade selling and 'protected' purchasing — in their economic relations as consumers paying heavy prices for high tariff goods, and as producers most of them selling against the competition of the world's markets." The same journal was less inspired when it gave space to the following paragraph, which, incidentally, is still an orthodox explanation of agrarian discontent: "Every few years there comes to the surface of things agricultural an organization of one kind or another that proposes to amend the world in the interest of the farmer . . . . When, after the lapse of time, the farmers find out that they have been 'fooled again,' the organization falls in pieces, and the agricultural classes go on with their farm work, taking their chances with the nation at large until they have forgotten the lesson and start again under fresh leaders to fresh disasters. A few years ago it was the Grange, now it is the Alliance."[52] And to-day, one

[51] *General laws of the state of Minnesota,* 1893, pp. 131-138; *Annual report of the railroad and warehouse commission,* 1894, pp. 35-36.

[52] *Nation,* 50:269, 329.

might add, it is the nonpartisan league and the American farm bureau federation.

But this argument fails to take into consideration the fact that the grange, the alliance, the league, and the federation have each in turn gained substantial victories for the farmers. None has obtained all that its founders expected of it, but each has made progress. By these organized protests the farmer from time to time has forced the older parties to take up his cause, and to grant him concession after concession. If in the end the organization he has used "falls in pieces," that is a small matter, provided the ground gained by it is not entirely lost. And the formation of another organization when more grievances are to be redressed is evidence that a lesson has been learned rather than that one has been forgotten. If our present day agrarian orders pass into oblivion after winning a few victories, how can it be said that they have failed? And who can blame the American farmer of some years hence if he endeavors once again to make history repeat itself?

John D. Hicks

North Carolina College for Women
Greensboro

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES IN LOUISIANA DURING THE FRENCH REGIME 1673 — 1763 [1]

In discussing the industrial development of the Mississippi valley during the French regime I shall deal only with agriculture, — first, because time will not permit a discussion of other French activities, and secondly, because the Mississippi valley is primarily agricultural.

The French people are practical; moreover, they were never enthusiastic colonizers; hence it was necessary to convince them that there were greater possibilities for them in Louisiana than in either Canada or France. This task fell to the missionaries, and the explorers, alert prospectors. Father Marquette begins the work with remarks on the excellence of the soil of the Mississippi valley, on the quantities of native fruits and vegetables, and on the ease with which wineries could be established. In 1676 Allouez reiterates all this, giving more details. Membré tells them: the soil is capable of providing all that can be desired for maintenance, even for a great colony; the climate is such that two crops can be grown annually; great herds of cattle, bearing a fine wool, scarcely inferior in quality to that grown upon the backs of sheep in France, graze upon vast prair-

[1] The facts for this paper were taken from: Transcripts, serie colonie C^{13}, B, and G 1 (recensements, concessions), and serie service hydrographique, especially vol. 67^{2}, nos. 8-16, and vol. 115^{10}, in the Library of congress; Jean, chevalier de Champigny, "Memoir of the present state of Louisiana," translated from the French in *Historical collections of Louisiana* (edited by Benjamin F. French — New York, 1846-1853), vol. 5; Kerlerec's report, 1756, printed in Marc, Baron de Villiers du Terrage, *Les dernières années de la Louisiane française: le chevalier de Kerlerec d'Abbadie, Aubry, Laussat* (Paris, 1904); *Découvertes et établissements des Français dans l'ouest et dans le sud de l'Amérique septentrionale, 1614-1754* (edited by Pierre Margry — Paris, 1876-1886); *The Jesuit relations and allied documents* (edited by Reuben G. Thwaites — Cleveland, 1896-1901); *Catholic historical publications,* vol. 10; Report of board of trade, 1721, published in *Documents relative to the colonial history of the state of New York* (edited by Edmund B. O'Callaghan — Albany, 1856-1887); and such well-known accounts of Louisiana as those of Bossu, Dumont, Du Pratz, Gravier, and La Harpe.

ies ready for the plow; hemp grows wild, — in quality superior to that produced in Canada, in quantity sufficient for all needed cordage; tar certainly can be made very near the sea; and finally, he has not had time to look for mines, but has found coal in several places; and the Indians have both lead and copper.

Douay, 1684-1688, who knew the valley better than any of the others quoted, is still more sweeping in his statements: Louisiana is the finest and most fertile country in the world; there are native foods in abundance for settlers; from the very time of arrival, a large family would have plenteous provisions, and in two years would be more at ease than anywhere in Europe; horses are to be had in plenty for every use, and so cheap that an Indian feels well paid when he receives an axe in exchange for a horse; Douay is sure sugar-cane can be grown, and can easily be introduced from the West Indies. He mentions the possibility of the grazing of sheep upon the prairies, and the development of a pearl industry on the gulf coast. The presence of mulberry trees in all the forests leads him to suggest the possibility of a silk industry.

Up to the very time of actual French settlement in both upper and lower Louisiana, such accounts frequently found their way to Canada and France. Argoud's relation (1697) restates all Douay said some ten years earlier, and adds these economic possibilities: a great lumber industry, ship timbers as fine as any in Norway, cedar and other colored woods for inlaid work (a commodity much needed in France) as beautiful as those found in Brazil, and the growing of both cotton and tobacco.

The period of purely economic prospecting ended about 1700. It would be difficult indeed to overstress the importance of this work or the facts that these men had had previous experience in Canada, and had spent most of their stay in the valley, in the generously fertile, healthful Illinois country, about which the churchmen could, with reasonable honesty, send those glowing "booster" accounts to Canada and France, making at least a few Frenchmen desirous to migrate to that earthly paradise.

Had the Mississippi been discovered by way of the gulf rather than the St. Lawrence, the writer is certain there would have been no French industries in Louisiana. The story of French colonization in warm climates, made with colonists drawn mainly

from France herself, shows colonies that were early abandoned or had long drawn out infancies. Louisiana certainly would have had the former fate, but for the Canadian prospectors, and the Illinois country.

If the discovery had been made at the mouth of the river, the prospectors' accounts would have read like this: there are no good harbors; the whole coast is low, sandy, and sterile; the mouth of the Mississippi is clogged with deltas that make it hard for sea-going vessels to enter, and throughout its course navigation on this river is most difficult; between the coast and "beautiful prairies ready for the plow" are miles of lagoons and coastal swamps, beyond which are lands covered by a semi-tropical jungle that must be cleared and drained before they are ready even for a hoe; the climate is hot, and unhealthful in summer, making it impossible for men to work longer than two hours morning and evening in clearing and breaking ground; there are millions of mosquitoes that torture us day and night; pelts are very apt to decay before they can be shipped to France. Would such accounts have led Canadians, much less Frenchmen, to desire to migrate to Louisiana?

The two French attempts at settlement on the gulf coast were very similar both as to the make-up of the expeditions, and the choice of the site for settlement. La Salle failed. Iberville succeeded because the Biloxi settlement received Canadian reinforcements the first year, and because Bienville was able to force each man to prepare, to plant, and to tend a plot of ground, thereby saving the colonists from starvation. Gardens begun under pressure in 1704, but continued voluntarily, were in 1713 producing a surplus which was sold to the Spanish garrison at Pensacola. This trade continued to the end of the French regime, and down to 1717 was practically the only industry at Mobile, where it furnished the settlers with a little money with which to buy European supplies.

Market-gardening developed somewhat differently at New Orleans. The Company of the west instructed settlers to plant gardens. After a year or two the suggestion was disregarded by some, and by 1723, there were many who were procuring such supplies from the so-called "German coast," some thirty miles above New Orleans. The palisaded gardens and the truck-

patches of these Germans provided cucumbers, salads, green peas and beans, artichokes, sweet-potato-greens, spinach, onions, pumpkins, dried peas and beans, French, Spanish, and English melons, sweet and white potatoes, and the water-melon, "the finest monument of the garden."

The products from these gardens, in 1731, besides the green vegetables, were three thousand barrels of potatoes, and one thousand of dried beans. On this coast in 1744 there were one hundred whites and two hundred blacks engaged in market-gardening, animal industry, and the making of butter and cheese. From 1750 to the end of French control the gardens were considered as belonging to the capital. Pointe Coupée, and other areas more distant, sent to New Orleans such supplies as dried peas and beans, pumpkins, and potatoes. Before the end of French control shipments of both dried peas and beans were made to the islands.

Notwithstanding that fruits and berries grew wild in Louisiana in great abundance, the French did much of the pioneer work in horticulture for the valley. They introduced the orange and lemon from Santo Domingo, the fig and pineapple from Provence, and the peach and two varieties of plums from Carolina. For these fruits they tested out the habitat and the methods of culture adapted to the new environment. Some consideration was given the olive, but the French did very little with this culture. Bienville, in all probability, was the first orange-grower in the Mississippi valley; he had in 1710 a fine grove on his plantation near the Mobile. By 1728 there were other beautiful orchards around Mobile and New Orleans. The French planted orange groves at no considerable distance north of New Orleans, and even there the trees were twice damaged by frost — in 1735 and 1748.

By 1728 the pineapple was cultivated quite extensively around New Orleans, and peach orchards were to be found in all the French settlements of the valley. Pears, plums, cherries, and apples were tried out in all localities. As far north as Natchez, the French found that such trees produced better wood than fruit. Even at Natchez, the fruit of the apple and pear was not so good as that grown in the Illinois country, where there were large apple orchards, usually containing a few pear trees.

The French cultivated grapes in all the settlements, but did nothing with the growing of berries.

The French brought wheat to Louisiana, and in that virgin, untried soil made test after test to find its proper habitat, finally demonstrating for all time, that the valley's best wheat areas lie north of the Ohio, and that, there, the fall sowings give the better results. The story of wheat growing in lower Louisiana begins with the patch Bienville planted at the Mississippi post in 1700. Flood, however, swept it away before it matured. Four years later Bienville again planted wheat, this time on his plantation near the Mobile, where he persistently sowed it year after year for ten years in the face of every kind of discouragement. As early as 1707 less courageous men had despaired; by 1711 few farmers were sanguine enough to assert that wheat could be successfully grown on the gulf coast, yet, as has been stated, the indefatigable Bienville went on planting wheat. Occasionally his patch escaped fogs during the maturing period and gave him a fair yield.

For the industrial development of Louisiana, the Company of the west placed the emphasis upon agriculture, especially upon wheat growing. Following the company's instructions, practically every farmer along the Mississippi and Red rivers in 1718 was growing a little wheat, and some good harvests were reported even below New Orleans. At Natchitoches they planted both a French and a Spanish red variety, the latter succeeding better. As late as 1735 this enthusiasm for wheat growing was but little abated, and not during the French period did the farmers cease to attempt to grow wheat in lower Louisiana. Rust was the growers' greatest obstacle; they tried many things in order to prevent it, but found nothing that could be relied upon.

In the Illinois country the French began the growing of wheat in 1687. This area, by 1721, was producing a surplus which, as flour, was shipped to New Orleans. Both wind- and horse-power flour mills were established, and in 1744 these mills had a surplus of over 800,000 pounds of flour. Two years later the Wabash settlements began to export wheat, and by 1750 the region above the Ohio was producing three times as much wheat, or wheat products, as was consumed there. Wheat culture in

upper Louisiana increased rapidly during the last ten years of French control; many shipments of wheat products for war supplies were made to the upper Ohio garrisons, to Detroit, and to New Orleans during the French and Indian war.

The French did practically none of the pioneer work for the growing of corn in the Mississippi valley; this work had been done by the Indians before their arrival. Indian fashion, the French, in lower Louisiana, selected the land for a corn field, then girdled the trees, burned off the canes, and the following day planted the corn. On such a field a single stalk would usually yield five or six ears, and a negro could produce about three barrels of shelled corn per acre. In the Illinois country the yield was a thousand fold. Besides the Indian variety, the French cultivated several other kinds of corn, such as white, red, blue, yellow, wrinkled, flat, and also a species that enabled them to grow two crops annually on the same ground. By 1738 this excess was three times the amount consumed.

For the rice culture the French did all the pioneer work. They brought rice from Carolina, where it had been introduced from Madagascar in 1684; they tested for the mean temperature required, the length of season, and the kinds of soil best suited to it. In making the soil test, they planted it on wet bottom lands where they grew it without irrigation, upon higher ground with irrigation, and on uplands where they planted it in winter and grew it without irrigation. Each soil produced rice, but the best quality and yield came from the irrigated fields. By 1719 most lower Louisiana farmers were growing rice crops, and ten years later the same condition prevailed. The census of New Orleans for 1731 gives that year's rice crop as 53,000 barrels, 50,600 of which came from one plantation. The rice surplus like that of corn was disposed of in the French American islands.

Rice culture was profitable only when in conjunction with other crops; otherwise there was too much idleness for slaves. The small farmer, with a slave or two, usually coupled it with cotton, wheat, and tobacco, while the planter linked it with tobacco, indigo, and lumbering. Possibly as early as 1713, certainly in 1720, the French were growing in Louisiana a variety of cotton known as "white Siam." It was very white, but not

so fine as the so-called "upland cotton." The French tried out cotton in all their settlements: the Illinois country was too cold; Vincennes, at thirty-nine degrees latitude, could grow cotton that would not mature in Carolina above thirty-six degrees. Ginning was a great handicap to the cotton growers. The French had several gins, but none with sufficient speed and perfection to stimulate cotton growing greatly.

A belief that the soil and climate of Louisiana was similar to that of Virginia led France to hope that her new colony would soon relieve her of her heavy English tobacco bill by producing what tobacco she needed. In 1713 a slump in the price of Virginia tobacco relieved the French purse, and simultaneously lessened her interest in Louisiana tobacco growing. This attitude of the French government had its effect upon the Louisiana farmers by causing them to slacken somewhat their activity in this industry. In a manner similar to that carried out for wheat and rice, soil and climatic conditions were tested for tobacco. The soil at Natchitoches, it was found, contained too much saltpeter to produce a good quality; the Illinois country had too short a season to insure maturing a crop; when the length of season permitted, an exceptionally fine quality of tobacco was produced at the Wabash settlements; Natchez grew good tobacco and gave a fine yield, but Pointe Coupée was the French tobacco field *par excellence* both as to quality and quantity. By way of pointing out the accuracy of the French work, it may be noted that the Pointe Coupée area still has some fame as to the quality of its tobacco, its yield is around 400 pounds per acre, and the old French method of preparing the tobacco for market is to some extent still in use.

Tobacco culture in Louisiana had some ups, but many downs. There were numerous natural pests to be overcome, freight troubles to be solved, and often there were seasons wholly unfavorable. Perhaps the heaviest blow received was in 1731, when the king became the sole buyer of Louisiana tobacco. Prices fell gradually for several years. This condition dampened the ardor of all growers for the culture and some of them gave up the industry. Others, however, kept on, and in 1735 Pointe Coupée shipped 100,000 pounds; in 1763, in spite of war conditions, Louisiana put on the market 180,000 pounds.

Notwithstanding the fact that none of the prospectors found indigo in Louisiana, it nevertheless grew there, and very soon the discovery of indigo meant to the French agriculturalists land with high productivity. The French made some experiments with the cultivation of wild indigo, alone, and also side by side with a variety that France had introduced earlier into her American islands from Hindostan. The foreign variety proved to be the better, and by 1720 was being grown on a number of Louisiana plantations.

Having determined upon the best variety of indigo, the French next took up the number of crops advisable to harvest annually from the same field. One, or at most two, in Louisiana equalled in quantity three in Santo Domingo, and excelled the island indigo in quality, being more copper colored and of a brighter hue. One slave, on fertile land, could grow from 50 to 70 pounds of indigo per acre.

By 1725 most Louisiana planters were growing indigo of the best quality, and in 1744 there were ten each of whom was producing annually 15,000 pounds. The growers struck their first real snag in 1747 when Carolina began to export indigo and England placed a bounty of six pence per pound on the Carolina product, which bounty enabled the English planters to double their equipment in three years. Just at this time a Spanish trade sprang up in Louisiana, because of the war. This trade dealt a staggering blow to all branches of agriculture by causing planters and farmers to neglect agriculture for trade. When the Spanish commerce suddenly ended in 1752, Louisiana was on the verge of ruin. Indigo growers weathered this economic storm and in 1762 put on the market 82,000 pounds of indigo, but succumbed when the colony was transferred to Spain, because this shut off their French market. The industry dragged on until 1793, when it was given up and the growing of cotton, sugar, and tobacco substituted.

About the middle of the seventeenth century France began to grow sugar-cane in her American islands; in 1725 she introduced all improved methods for making sugar. From Santo Domingo Iberville brought sugar-cane plants to Louisiana in 1700. As in the case of the other plants introduced, the French made experiments in order to find the proper Louisiana condi-

tions for the sugar-cane, which they found did not thrive in a more severe climate than that of the environs of New Orleans. In 1730 a plan was worked out for the using of 325 whites and 1,900 blacks in growing sugar-cane in Louisiana; at this time the colony was producing about 2,500 pounds of sugar, annually, besides the molasses. Louisiana in 1751 had a few sugar-cane plantations and one planter who owned a sugar mill. Ten years later there were a number of such mills around the capital and New Orleans sugar and molasses were said to be of good quality.

The French introduced oats, barley, buckwheat, and millet, and tested out suitable Louisiana habitats for them. Hemp and flax grew wild and were mentioned by the prospectors as Mississippi valley economic possibilities, yet the French did nothing with them because in 1720 the French government prohibited the establishment of colonial industries competitive with those in France. Hemp and flax fell under this law. Hops grew wild in all parts of Louisiana, but were cultivated for commercial purposes. The French experimented with the vines, and found the hilly uplands best suited to hop growing.

The time element shuts out of the discussion the French land system, French agricultural methods, and agricultural implements, and permits a mere mention of other industries in which the French made contributions to the industrial development of the Mississippi valley, such as the making of pitch, tar, brick, silk, and wax, lumbering, stock raising, and the fur trade, which was responsible for the founding and early development of the city of St. Louis.

Mrs. N. M. Miller Surrey

New York City

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

The Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan Manuscripts

These old business records of a large pre-revolutionary business concern located in Philadelphia were found sometime since in the Pennsylvania state library at Harrisburg. How they got there or how long they have been there it is impossible, at present, to say.[1] The fact is, in the division of public records, they now repose securely locked in steel cases. They consist of John Baynton's private letter book, letter books of other members of the firm, journals, waste-books, blotters, invoice books, a cash book, a ledger, an account book showing Indian trade at Fort Allen, Fort Augusta, and Fort Pitt, an account book of batteau men and waggoners, and a memorandum book. Before giving a description of these manuscripts it is perhaps well to say a word about the firm, of the business of which they give a complete history from 1754 to 1776.

Alvord and Carter in their *Critical period,* discussing the early western trade, make this comment upon the company: "The firm of Baynton, Wharton and Morgan was one of the earliest firms to open up the western trade and was the first to extend its connections as far as the Illinois. Besides its trading interests, the partners entered largely into western land speculation. They were the chief promoters of the Indiana company which was formed of merchants who suffered losses at the outbreak of Pontiac's conspiracy and claimed, as compensation from the Indians, lands situated in modern West Virginia. The firm was also the backbone of a company that planned the establishment of a company in Illinois." This statement of these two well-known writers on Illinois history shows something of the initiative of the firm and the extent of their interests. What follows will reveal that many of the adven-

[1] Mr. Turner will perhaps permit a guess. The state probably seized these manuscripts when members of the Wharton family were under suspicion of toryism during the revolutionary war. C. W. A.

tures of these merchants were so large that they compare favorably both in vision and in volume with the undertakings of much more modern concerns doing big business.

The senior member of the firm was John Baynton, son of Peter Baynton, who for many years was a prominent merchant of Philadelphia. Young Baynton early won favor for good qualities possessed, it was said, to a degree not common in that day for one of his age. His endowments seem to have been such as commerce requires, for while still a youth he entered business and it was not long before his eminence as a merchant was as great as that which his father had achieved. When the firm "Baynton and Wharton" was organized he became the senior member and soon was engaged in much more imposing enterprises than had previously engaged his attention. Samuel Wharton, the second member of the firm, early became interested in the western trade; and his powers, which were many and great, were used to such advantage that he soon became expert in that trade and in Indian affairs. His knowledge was so valuable that Sir William Johnson and other Indian agents are said to have found it profitable to consult him. He took a prominent part with other traders in the treaty of Fort Stanwix in October and November, 1769, and soon thereafter was chosen by them to protect their interests in England. While there he promoted vast land schemes, but the methods pursued provoked antagonisms both at home and among members of the English ruling party. The enemies thus created, together with his correspondence with Benjamin Franklin favoring the American revolution and other causes which will appear later, caused the ultimate failure of his schemes and his flight to France, where he remained until the war was over.

The third member of the firm was George Morgan, a pugnacious, belligerent young business man, whose fearlessness and aggressiveness was a great asset to the firm. His marriage to Baynton's daughter tied him to the interests of the senior member and from the time he entered the firm he disapproved of Wharton's western development schemes. Notwithstanding his objections to the Illinois adventure, as a favor to Mr. Wharton he consented to take charge of the development of this trade. While in this region he won the favor of the Indians, whose

regard for him impelled them to confer upon him the revered title of "Tammany," the name of one of their most famous chiefs. He was an enthusiastic advocate of the revolutionary war and backed his devotion by his deeds in the war.

Now as to the manuscripts, and first of all the letter books. The first of the letter books in point of time covers the period from October, 1763, to February, 1766. The persons addressed are Robert Callender, Alexander Lowry, Captain Thomas McKee, and a large number of firms, mostly foreign, with which the company did business. John Baynton's private letter book begins November 24, 1769, and ends with June 9, 1770. Within its one hundred and forty-one pages he unveils his soul to Abel James, John Campbell, Samuel Wharton, Sir William Johnson, George Crogan, and George Morgan.

The inside story of the business of the firm, its precarious condition, his hopes and fears for it, his losses and those of his family, and the impression which Mr. Wharton's activities in London are making on him and those about him — all of these are told in a most sincere and plaintive manner. The letters to George Crogan speak of his business relations with the firm and throw interesting light on that gentleman's methods. In the correspondence with him it develops that the firm has property in the Illinois region at the time valued at fifty-odd thousand pounds and that the members hope for a remittance of twenty thousand pounds by January 1, 1771. He calls this a contemptible sum "compared with the just expectations from that wretched country."

The last of the letter books carries dates from 1763 to 1774 but no letters appear between May 8, 1764, and October, 1771. The early ones, for the most part, deal with business matters wholly, and the firms addressed are the same as those found in the first book cited. They are located in places as widely separated as Halifax, Nova Scotia, and Leghorn, Italy, with the West Indies, England, and France also included. After 1771 the letters are written principally by George Morgan and are addressed to Samuel Wharton in London. There are several to George Crogan and others to Benjamin Franklin and William Trent, but Wharton is his prey and he pursues him relentlessly. If what Morgan wrote to Wharton was true, and there is noth-

ing to prove the contrary, then these letters may give some additional hint of the reason for the latter's prolonged stay in London and his flight to France instead of to America after the failure of his negotiations. They are bitter excoriations of Wharton's conduct especially as it related to Mr. Baynton. Morgan charges Wharton directly with the responsibility for Baynton's death and warns him that for his infamous part he will have to render to Morgan personally complete satisfaction. He challenges him to come to America and face the situation his acts have created, and threatens, if he tries to escape to some other land, to pursue him and to continue to follow him until he obtains justice. He scoffs at Wharton's assumption of superior airs and his expectation of receiving titles and offices — emoluments which he seems to think of more worth than justice to his friends and the payment of his debts. He predicts the failure of the enterprises in which Wharton is engaged in promoting and declares that even his friends in Philadelphia are losing confidence in his ability to win. He accuses him of having already spent £10,000 of the firm's and other people's money on his luckless adventure, for if he had been at home attending to business vastly more than this sum could have been made.

On the whole, these letters though lurid in their utterances are interesting reading, and since most of the predictions in them were later varified they possess more than ordinary significance for the student of the Wharton enterprises. It is unfortunate that there is no record among the Harrisburg collection of Wharton's replies to these communications. Perhaps they may be found in another place. It is to be hoped so.

Of the journals there are four, lettered A, B, C, and D. Journal A dates from October 18, 1763, to the end of January, 1766; B runs from February, 1766, to May, 1767; C from June, 1767, to February 1, 1773; D from April 1, 1767, to February 1, 1771. The accounts of Journal D duplicate those of C. There are in Journal D, however, additional accounts from October, 1774, to April, 1776. There is a supplement to Journal A carrying accounts to October 10, 1765, and a Journal B, so-called, which seems to be part of another set, for it dates from March 18, 1754, to July 3, 1760. The four first named journals in-

cluding the supplement give large and detailed accounts of the adventures to Fort Augusta, Pittsburg, Detroit, and the Illinois region. There are also entries showing the transactions of Crogan, Callandar and Spear, Stephen and Daniel Duncan, and many others with the firm. The early Journal B carries principally accounts of wines and spirits bought in Jamaica. It also contains a statement of the assets and liabilities of Baynton in 1754.

The waste books are five in number, dating from November 10, 1758, to the end of March, 1767. The first is from November 10, 1758, to March 6, 1760, and the accounts are with the persons named before. There are entries of flour shipped to many different places with other shipping accounts. The second dates from March 6, 1760, to June 2, 1761, and continues the record of the business of the firm. A few new names are noticed and a wider range of trading is shown. The third, from August 2, 1762, to November 4, 1765, is devoted principally to the transactions of Callendar and Spear and reveals these men to be large traders. There are, besides, many insurance accounts and invoices of goods sent to London and other foreign ports. The fourth, from June 8, 1765, to April 7, 1776, has entries of flour bought and sold, together with business done with Fort Pitt and Fort Augusta. The fifth, from March 5, 1766, to March 31, 1767, is devoted almost exclusively to accounts relating to the adventure to Pittsburg and Fort Pitt. There are transactions with Crogan, Callendar and Spear, and others. An entry relating to the Paxton affair throws an interesting sidelight on it.

The four blotters cover a period of almost nine years — from August 30, 1762, to June 10, 1769. The earliest one, beginning with the date first mentioned, goes to September 30, 1763. In it the names already mentioned so frequently again appear. Business is with the west and foreign ports. The next one runs from October 18, 1763, to August 29, 1764, and is similar in its records to Journal A, of which it seems to be a supplement. The remaining blotters are duplicate records. The first, from April 7, 1766, to February 10, 1767, repeats the accounts of Waste book number 5. The other, marked Blotter B, dating from February 10, 1767, to June 10, 1769, is a repetition, for the most part, of

Journals C and D. It carries, also, George Morgan's expense account for his Illinois service.

Among the miscellaneous books is an invoice book, August, 1763, to February, 1776, with invoices of goods shipped by London merchants. Others show amounts of goods shipped from Philadelphia to Lancaster, thence to Carlisle and on to Pittsburg and the Illinois. Two old invoice books showing immense quantities of goods worth large sums of money are undated and show no destination for the goods shipped. There is a cash and invoice book combined, dating from 1763 to 1769, giving lists of drafts, orders to pay to and receipts of moneys from large numbers of people, among them Crogan, Simons, Gratz, Callendar, and others. Memoranda and lists of goods sent to Pittsburg and the Illinois region amount to the vast sum of £401,000 Pennsylvania money. This book also contains the record of moneys owed by the firm at the time the business was turned over to trustees. The ledger, 1767 to 1770, shows a list of 240 customers. Indian trade at Fort Pitt, Fort Augusta, and Fort Allen forms the contents of another book. It states the trade at Fort Augusta between 1758 and 1762 to be £14,053 13*s.* 5*d.* The Account book of batteau men and waggoners, 1766-1774, shows 323 men in the employ of the firm from September, 1766, to the end of 1769. Among these are 223 batteau men and 53 waggoners. The rest are hunters, procurers, a nurse, interpreters, coopers, ditchers, house carpenters, boat builders, and sawyers. The total amount paid these employees was £5,985 8*s.* 9*d.* A memorandum book, January 1, 1763, to September, 1765, notes moneys to be paid, goods to be sent to and expected from foreign ports, letters to be written, and other matters of importance which are not to be forgotten.

This concludes what is confessed to be a very inadequate statement of the contents of these old account books. But from even this scant description it must be evident that the claim made in the beginning that they contain valuable historical material is amply justified.

Morris K. Turner

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

The economic basis of politics. By Charles A. Beard (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1922. 99 p. $1.50)

This little volume comprises four lectures delivered at Amherst college in 1916. Drawing upon universal history for its data, it presents a valuable philosophical sequel to the author's earlier and more detailed studies on *The economic interpretation of the constitution* and *The economic origin of Jeffersonian democracy.* The opening lecture deals with "The doctrines of the philosophers." Six outstanding political thinkers are selected as representing not only different periods in the history of political ideas, but also viewpoints as widely divergent and typical as possible. This list comprises Aristotle, Machiavelli, Locke, Madison, Webster, and Calhoun. An examination into the political philosophy of each of these men leads to the conclusion that "they believed that the fundamental factors with which the statesman has to deal are the forms and distribution of property and the sentiments and views arising from the possession of different degrees and kinds of property" (page 44). The second lecture is entitled "Economic groups and the structure of the state," and from data drawn from the histories, among others, of the English, the French, and the American constitutions, it is made clear that the structure of government has been deliberately adjusted to a recognized division of society into groups or estates, each of which possesses more or less distinct economic interests. There follows a chapter on "The doctrine of political equality." Here is sketched the nature and influence of Rousseau's revolutionary theory that all men are free and equal regardless of economic status, and particularly the early injection into American political thought of the doctrine of the political equality of all men. All of the foregoing leads Mr. Beard to a consideration in his last lecture of "The contradiction and the outcome." "Modern equalitarian democracy, which reckons all heads as equal and alike, cuts sharply athwart the philosophy and practice of the past centuries" and yet the "democratic device of universal suffrage does not destroy economic classes or inequalities." Here is the "most astounding political contradiction that the world has ever witnessed." Can it be solved? Certainly it has not been solved, as a brief review of various attempts

such as proportional representation, sovietism, and communism makes plain. Nor does Dr. Beard have a solution to offer. Modern democracy must recognize the presence of numerous economic interests and groups and must do its best toward the "regulation of these various and interfering interests." "In other words there is no rest for mankind, no final solution of eternal contradictions . . . the recognition of this fact is the beginning of wisdom — and of statesmanship."

These lectures form a stimulating contribution to modern political thought. Their necessary brevity is disappointing to the reader — and doubtless to the author. Lack of space has prevented the elaboration of many interesting points and has tended to make the confused and complicated relation of economic and political forces assume a simplicity and definiteness of outline the existence of which Mr. Beard would be the first to deny.

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN

Opening a highway to the Pacific, 1838-1846. By James Christy Bell, Jr. [Columbia university studies in history, economics, and public law, volume xcvi, number 1.] (New York: Columbia university, 1921. 209 p.)

This book is very interesting in spite of the fact that it is a doctor's thesis. It forms a part of one of the volumes of the *Columbia university studies* and may also be had separately. The title is misleading. The real subject is the cause of the early emigration to Oregon. The first four chapters are introductory, put in for background and to make enough bulk for a thesis. They summarize successively the early English and American explorations of Oregon, the diplomatic negotiations, the swarming of the fur traders, and the beginning of the missions. These summaries are excellent. The chapter on diplomatic negotiations makes it clear that Great Britain did not claim anything south of the Columbia river but does not make it sufficiently clear that the United States, by repeated offers to settle the boundary upon the line of the forty-ninth parallel, was estopped from claiming or at least from getting anything north of that line. The only region really in dispute therefore lay between the Columbia and the forty-ninth parallel. The chapter on the fur traders should dispel the delusion, if it is still entertained by anyone, that the trans-Missouri region was at this time *terra incognita.* In the chapter on the missions, the author repeats the story of the first Flathead delegation without any inkling of the fact that it is almost certainly pure fabrication — the outcome of the bitter feeling between the protestant and the Catholic missions, a feeling that was more bitter on the side of the protestants since they were less successful with the

Indians. Upon this point he should consult the article by Major Edmond Mallet in the *United States Catholic historical magazine* for January of 1888.

The main point of the thesis is contained in chapter vi on agrarian discontent in the Mississippi valley after the recurring crisis of 1839. There was a complete collapse of credit and circulating medium and no market for surplus produce — a condition from which the middle west was eventually rescued by the coming of the railroads. It was this condition that caused the Oregon emigration. In the far west land would be absolutely free and an assured market was expected from the opening of the China trade — the original impulse to the building of a Pacific railway. Doubtless all emigrations have resulted from hard times in the region from which people emigrated, but Mr. Bell is entitled to the credit of showing more specifically than has ever been done before that this was the cause of the Oregon emigration. We are coming to see that in all our emigrations the basic motive has been economic and the political motive either incidental or an after-thought. More might have been made of the disposition of the pioneer to think that the land farther on was better, much as the rut on the other side of the road always looks better than the one in which a man is driving. This disposition made for the settlement of the country but was often bad for the pioneer.

There are two supplementary chapters and a summary of conclusions. The first gives an account of the overland journey by way of the Oregon trail and the second tells the story of the settlement of the Willamette valley and the provisional government. As the author's interpretations in the latter chapter agree with the reviewer's, they may be accepted as correct. There is an appendix on "saving Oregon." The author's view is that, inasmuch as Oregon was never in danger of being lost, it was not "saved." The reviewer thinks that the author attaches insufficient importance to the coming of the pioneers. While it was true that nothing that happened subsequent to 1818 could technically affect the rights of either claimant, nevertheless actual settlement would practically strengthen the American position. The pioneers had not yet reached the region in dispute but might at any time overflow into it. The United States was eager to settle the controversy on account of Mexican complications. The British government could not have been unmindful of the danger involved in the cry of "fifty-four forty" and was willing to settle while the settling was still fairly good.

The book is illustrated with several views taken from early travels and with a reproduction of nearly the whole of Mitchell's map for 1846 of Texas, Oregon, and California.

F. H. Hodder

Aspects of Americanization. By Edward Hale Bierstadt. (Cincinnati: Stewart Kidd company, 1922. 260 p. $2.00)

The American spirit in the writings of Americans of foreign birth. Selections chosen and edited by Robert E. Stauffer. (Boston: The Christopher publishing house, 1922. 185 p. $2.00)

Graded lessons in English for Italians. An aid in Americanization. By Angelo di Domenica. (Boston: The Christopher publishing house, 1922. 282 p. $2.00)

The Wilson administration and the great war. By Ernest W. Young. (Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1922. 466 p. $5.00)

It is a dull day that fails to produce a book or pamphlet on Americanization. The authors are supposed to sing the same tune, but even unaccustomed ears — foreign and native — can detect disharmony. These writers are agreed neither in method nor curriculum, and it is indeed doubtful if they are shooting at the same mark. Himself connected with an organization which enabled him to observe "intensive Americanization at first hand," Mr. Bierstadt has arrived at the conclusion that "there is no royal road to Americanization." He has little faith in a hothouse system of making good Americans, although he would probably recommend placing in the hands of foreigners *Graded lessons in English* and extracts from the writings of such eminent Americans of foreign birth as Philip Schaff, Francis Lieber, Carl Schurz, Hans Mattson, Jacob Riis, Felix Adler, Mary Antin, Oscar Straus, E. A. Steiner, and Otto H. Kahn. According to Mr. Bierstadt, the whole problem of Americanization is to define the American point of view; but if the immigrant does not believe in it, there should be no resort to force. "Far better a sincere alien than a half-convinced American. Americanism cannot be taught; it must be experienced. Who is there in this country to-day so bold as to say to the foreign born 'I will teach you to be an American'?" *Aspects of Americanization* is not a history, but it can be recommended to historians as well as to those who are not of the elect.

If Mr. Bierstadt's volume is a possible candidate for the Lusk committee's Index, Mr. Young's book is absolutely "smelling-committee"-proof. Mr. Young, who thinks he has written a history, is a dogmatic American. Not that he formulates a creed of Americanism; he defines Americanism by contrast — it is pretty nearly everything that Woodrow Wilson was not: Wilsonism is the antithesis of Americanism. And he proves it to his own satisfaction by marshalling evidence from George Harvey's *War weekly* and *North American review, Leslie's weekly,* the *Boston Transcript,* the field secretary of the national security league, the president of the American newspaper publishers' associa-

tion, Senator Lodge, Senator Reed, Senator Wadsworth, Senator Chamberlain, Senator Smoot, Nicholas Murray Butler, Chancellor Day, Ole Hanson, and similar "material."

The reviewer does not believe that the author would take exception to the statement that the 466 pages of his book constitute an attempt to prove that though "the conflagration which began its devastation of Europe in the summer of 1914 [brought] forth the real spirit of America," it was in spite of Wilson's administration. If chapters xi and xii do not directly charge the president of the United States with disloyalty, they most certainly do so by thinly veiled inference. The whole book, if it can claim any serious consideration from historians, can do so only as a textbook on unhistorical method or as an example of blind political partisanship. To Mr. Young Woodrow Wilson is not "the man of mystery." Two simple facts explain him: his overweening ambition for personal ends and the fact that his own chosen channels for accomplishing his purposes were often outside the limits set by present moral standards of society. How the historian whose search for truth keeps the midnight oil burning must envy a brother who can reduce a man's life to a formula!

Neither the importance of the book demands nor the allotment of space allows an extended review of the catalogue of crimes of Wilson and Wilsonism. Here are a few specimens chosen at random. Mr. Garrison was displaced by a man known to be antagonistic to the best Americanism. "What Secretary Baker cost the country in money and lives will probably never be known." "Public opinion was lynched. Freedom of thought for the first time in American history was suppressed." Upon the administration rests the responsibility for the defection of Russia and the odium of disloyalty to the allies. Wilson failed to eulogize the constitution on his league of nations speaking tour. The Adamson law was probably the most considerable bribe ever offered and paid for the presidency. Wilson's railings at the senate majority are perhaps the most humiliating episode our history of the presidency records. The crime wave following in the wake of the war must in large measure be attributed to the profligacy and dishonesty of the administration in dealing with the public. Before sitting in the peace conference Wilson went up and down Europe turning loose the anarchistic elements against orderly governments. It was at Milan, the hotbed of socialism in Italy, that he reached the pinnacle of his popularity. Those in the administration who did undertake to represent the genuine American spirit were excluded from the administration counsels. Instead, men like George D. Herron, George Creel, Lincoln Steffens, Norman Hapgood, and William C. Bullitt were appointed to important positions, whose large aim was to

overturn American tradition, perhaps pushing to one side the constitution itself.

But Mr. Young does not mourn as do those without hope. His brand of democracy is as broad and deep as humanity itself—for he himself has said it. The dangerous corner was turned in 1920. "The supreme efforts of Bolshevism to capture the great democracy of the western hemisphere, materially aided by the indifference if not actual sympathy of the administration, failed. Falsifying organized-labor leaders were taught a severe lesson in the trouncing it, together with Wilsonism, received at the hands of the great mass of the people in the national election of that year. . . Social justice and higher ideals of even the traditional Americanism were given a new impetus. The world looks brighter than ever before." Q. E. D.

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON

Albion W. Tourgée. By Roy F. Dibble. (New York: Lemke and Buechner, 1921. 160 p. $1.50)

When *A fool's errand* appeared in 1879, the author, Albion W. Tourgée, was hailed as the "Victor Hugo of America." It was frequently asserted that in this book might be discerned at last the "great American novel." Expression of the northern view of the book and the author may be given in the dictum of the Concord, New Hampshire, *Monitor*: "It may be well to inquire, in view of the power here displayed, whether the long-looked-for native American novelist who is to rival Dickens, and equal Thackeray, and yet imitate neither, has not been found." Even the *Raleigh Observer* of North Carolina acknowledged that the book was a "powerfully written work, and destined, we fear, to do as much harm in the world as 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' to which it is, indeed, a companion piece." The total sale of the book was something over one hundred thousand copies — and there were several printed editions of the book in the United States and in England.

Albion Winegar Tourgée was born in Williamsfield, Ohio, on May 2, 1838. In the preparation of this excellent biography of about one hundred and fifty pages, presumably as a doctor's thesis at Columbia university, the author has been fortunate in securing access to a large amount of important biographical material — principally private correspondence, fragments of autobiography, and a record of Judge Tourgée's life laboriously kept for many years by his true helpmate and devoted wife. Dying on May 21, 1905, Tourgée left behind him a record singularly uneven, a career marked by extraordinary variations of fortune, and a reputation as writer and novelist which had sadly waned for many years before his death. In North Carolina, during his sojourn of fourteen years there, he had been execrated by the people of

that state as have few men in its history — for his share in the evils of reconstruction, his vitriolic tongue, his defiance of the Ku Klux Klan, and his persistent, ill-advised encouragement of the political ambitions of the native negroes. His conduct brought upon him the most vigorous denunciation as a "vile wretch" and a "most contemptible character"; but no one ever charged him with cowardice, although at times he lived in daily dread of losing his life, and even his bitterest enemies acknowledged him to be a brilliant man and an excellent judge.

Tourgée's chief claim to fame lies in a series of novels, chiefly dealing with reconstruction, of which the most famous is *A fool's errand*; and a crusade in behalf of the negro race, which he ardently desired to educate and uplift. Over a period of years, he made strenuous efforts in behalf of the education of the negroes at government expense. None of his novels is a work of first class art; for his ambitions were so numerous, his energies so scattered, that he never found it possible to force himself to devote his undivided attention to art. Had he devoted as much time and energy to improve his art as he did to "bettering humanity" — and one wonders how much better off humanity is for his strangely misguided efforts! — he would doubtless have become a better novelist — though never, surely, a great one. "His works suffer," pertinently observes his biographer, "as most Victorian literature suffers, because of their dual aim — artistic excellence plus doctrinal inculcation." In the end, Tourgée himself acknowledged, in a work of fiction that will always hold a definite place by reason of historical associations, that the attempt of the north to superimpose its type of civilization upon the south was "a fool's errand." At the end of his southern residence, Tourgée had abandoned all his policies and reforms except one: the demand for an effective system of public schools. That demand is still eloquently in force to-day.

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON

James K. Polk: a political biography. By Eugene Irving McCormac. (University of California press: Berkeley, California, 1922. 746 p. $5.00)

Many persons with Mr. McCormac believed long since that "the character and success of Polk's political career entitled him to a place" in either the *American statesmen series* or the *American crisis biographies.* Many others, when they read this volume, will join in the opinion, for not only has the author produced a good piece of biographical writing but he has succeeded in presenting a picture of the Tennesseean far removed from the conception which has more or less popularly been entertained. An adequate biography does not seek to make the subject a hero; its author does not become so bewitched by the man whose career

he describes that he loses his sense of proportion and tends, unconsciously probably, to magnify accomplishments and minimize other factors and other individuals. A detached point of view, an impersonal approach, a due recognition of conditioning circumstances, and, withal, a scrupulous adherence to the facts as they are obtainable; these factors enter into biographical literature to produce a sane and, so far as is humanly possible, an impartial account. To a noteworthy degree Polk's biographer has observed the rules of the game with the result that he has given a picture of one of the most interesting of America's public men in such a manner as to remove from his memory much of the obscurity which has surrounded it.

A political biography it is avowedly, for, as the statement in the preface announces, it was not the writer's purpose to "write a personal biography." About one-third of the book deals with Polk prior to the time when politicians were engaged in the selection of candidates for the presidency in 1844. After a brief chapter on the early life of Polk, Professor McCormac considers him as a member of congress, where he was a supporter of President Jackson particularly in the struggle against the United States bank, as a contestant for and the holder of the speakership of the federal house of representatives, as governor of Tennessee, and as a public man temporarily retired through his defeat by James C. Jones, whom Polk's political opponents pitted against him in the gubernatorial campaign of 1841. The remaining two-thirds and more of the book deal with Polk as candidate for president and as chief executive.

In the earlier portions of the book the detailed following of the political game, locally for Tennessee and nationally, sometimes causes the reader to lose himself in the undergrowth; a somewhat monotonous style adds to the task of extrication. When, however, the more important phases of Polk's career are reached not only does the writer achieve a more pleasing manner but the detail assumes greater relevancy. The important episodes of this later period are treated carefully and with the successful intention of showing just what happened and, so far as might be, the causes of what took place. The chapter on the "Selection of candidates, 1844," is the best and most lucid account of the choice of "the first dark horse" by a national party so far available. The Oregon question, the Mexican situation culminating in the war with all its perplexing political ramifications, the obtruding slavery issue, all are surveyed with a meticulous scrupulosity that is a joy to the reader.

Of course no reader who has studied the same period with any care would agree absolutely with the proportion or assent to every nicety of selection. Some, for instance, would be inclined to give more weight to the English side of the Oregon question, to a fuller consideration of such

factors as the tariff situation on both sides of the Atlantic. Others might give more weight to the significance of "manifest destiny" as it bore upon expansion, or consider that the Tehuantepec matter ought to have been emphasized in the discussion of the reception of the Mexican treaty when it was before the senate in 1848. Again there could arise the question whether enough attention has been paid to the western enthusiasm for Texas and for aggression against Mexico, an enthusiasm which must have been potent with a man from the middle Mississippi valley, and one might wonder why no reference is made to Professor Dodd's little study of this phenomenon which appeared a few years ago in the *Journal of the Illinois historical society.* To stress these and similar points, however, would be ungrateful and unjust to the author.

Professor McCormac has presented an unvarnished picture of a strong party man, a conservative, a politician who knew about all the tricks of the game as it was played in his day, and, in more than one respect, a statesman. He has demonstrated that, although Polk was "forgotten," as Schouler puts it, "his tariff policy led to prosperity; that his 'constitutional treasury' proved to be successful; that his 'Polk Doctrine' has been approved and extended; and that his expansion policy added over five hundred thousand square miles of territory and gave the United States free access to the Pacific." "Why," asks the author, "has he not received full credit for his achievements? Undoubtedly one reason is that he possessed little personal magnetism, while his uncompromising independence dissatisfied all factions; and consequently, he had no personal following to sound his praises and perpetuate his memory."

One regrets that the typography and format of the book are not worthy of the contents.

The conduct of American foreign relations. By John Mabry Mathews. (New York: The Century company, 1922. 353 p.)

In this admirable study the author has approached his subject from the standpoint of political science rather than that of history. He is not interested in the course of our diplomatic history save insofar as historical events serve "to illustrate the principles and problems" in question. He is concerned rather "with the organization of the government for the conduct of foreign relations, the control exercised by its various branches therein, and the methods of procedure followed." In short, it is a study of an important phase of our constitutional law and practice.

The work contains little that is essentially new in subject matter or distinctive in conclusion, but it affords an excellent analysis and summary of some of our chief legal problems in the field of foreign

relations. Many of the specific questions at issue have recently aroused the bitterest personal and partisan controversies, but throughout the treatment the author has been singularly successful in avoiding even the slightest suspicion of special pleading or partisanship. He has not hesitated to express definite opinions upon many of the points at issue, but such have been the liberality of his outlook and the soundness of his reasoning that his arguments cannot fail to command respect for their scholarly quality and essential fairmindedness even though they may not always carry conviction to the general reader.

The topical method of treatment has been used to good advantage though there is an unfortunate tendency to repetition in several chapters of the book. The author has made excellent use of the chief secondary authorities together with much of the monographic and magazine material on various phases of the subject.

There are, however, certain manifest limitations in the mode of treatment. In looking at his subject almost entirely from a constitutional point of view, the author has failed to bring out clearly the fundamental difficulty in our whole system of foreign relations, namely, the difficulty of reconciling our constitutional principles with our international obligations. The powers of the various organs of government are fixed by the constitution whereas their responsibilities to foreign states are determined according to principles of international law. In order to secure a comprehensive view of our foreign relations, the subject, therefore, should be examined from the international, as well as the constitutional point of view.

Notwithstanding its general high standard of scholarship, a few minor slips have been allowed to creep into the text. The author refers (page 30) to a suggestion that one of our states might enter into an agreement with a bordering Canadian province for the regulation of fisheries, but he overlooks the fact that the Canadian provinces do not possess the like international contractual capacity. Moreover, the general proposition (page 86) that "when the court takes a treaty as the rule for its guidance and enforces it without auxiliary Congressional legislation, it may be assumed that the treaty relates to matters not embraced among the subjects upon which the Constitution specifically authorizes Congress to exercise legislative power" is altogether too sweeping a generalization. For example, a large part of our prize law is based upon international agreements, notwithstanding the fact that congress is given power "to make rules concerning captures on land and water." It is scarcely correct to say (page 192) that the London convention was defeated by the "adverse attitude of parliament" since only the house

of lords refused to ratify that agreement. A more serious inaccuracy may be found in the statement (page 271) that article 16 of the league of nations convenant "provides for the automatic creation of a state of war between a peace-breaking member and all the remaining members." According to the article in question a violation of the provision constitutes only "an act of war," which is something fundamentally different from the creation of a state of war, as Professor Mathews very properly points out in another connection.

But these minor criticisms do not detract materially from the high value of the work as a whole. The volume, it is safe to prophesy, will be recognized as one of the most authoritative and valuable expositions of the legal principles affecting our international relations.

C. D. Allin

The American party system. By Charles E. Merriam. (New York: The Macmillan company. 436 p. $3.00)

Although not lacking in the scholarly presentation of facts, this volume is a good deal more than an accumulation of data regarding primary elections, ballot reforms, and corrupt practice acts. In it Professor Merriam offers his interpretation of the nature and significance of the American party system, and its place in the complex of modern social forces.

The author's main thesis seems to be that the political party cannot be adequately understood if viewed simply as a political mechanism or simply as the organization of well defined economic groups. All such simplicity of analysis is misleading. The party must be regarded rather as one of a large number of interrelated and competing agencies through which public opinion finds expression and modern social interest and desires struggle for satisfaction. With this in view two chapters are given to "The composition of the political party," in which the make-up of party rank and file is presented in cross section and the various ingredients of occupation, race, economic interest, sectional interest, hereditary allegiance and the like are carefully evaluated. In four chapters on "The spoils system" the pathology of the party system is portrayed, not merely in the form of patronage but also in the prostitution of legislative, administrative, and judicial machinery to illicit ends. Professor Merriam finds one of the chief causes of the spoils system to be the "wide discrepancy between the industrial and the political balance of power" since "it is quite clear that if a few men own all or most of the property, while the mass of the people have all or most of the votes, disturbances and corruption are bound to ensue. Those who control the property will try to turn their dollars into votes and their

property into political power'' (page 187). In a chapter on ''The party as a formulator of principles and policies'' is a valuable discussion of the true significance and composition of platforms, and emphasis is again laid upon the heterogeneous interests, impulses, and ideas which cause men to align themselves under one standard or the other in the American bi-party system. It is also made clear that the party is but one of many competing agencies in the formulation of public policy. Three chapters deal with the more mechanical aspects of the party system, treating of nominations, elections, and appointments. These aim to present general principles and tendencies rather than details. The author then examines the various theories and interpretations of the party system which have been advanced by other students of the problem and presents in some detail his own ideals of the nature and function of parties, the general purport of which has been mentioned. In a final chapter are discussed ''Tendencies toward party reconstruction,'' which are of three general types. The first of these includes what may be called the mechanism of political reform, such as the merit system in civil service, the short ballot, direct primaries, and the like. Professor Merriam recognizes that such schemes alone are powerless to work our political redemption. A second group of influences in the realm of social and economic relations is at work producing organizations and groups which compete with political parties and which will tend to weaken the grip of the boss and the old-type machine. Here must be reckoned the movements tending in the direction of industrial democracy. Finally there are those subtler influences which the author terms political *mores*. Herein lies our chief hope of release from the grip of the present system. The real political education of the people is in its infancy, but from its development is to be expected an elevation in the whole tone of our political life. The author closes, however, with the final caution that we cannot hope to reform the party system more rapidly than we clarify the political thought and purify the social ethics of the people.

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN

A history of the United States since the civil war. In five volumes. Volume II: 1868-1872. By Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer. (New York: The Macmillan company, 1922. 614 p. $4.00)

The recent death of William A. Dunning gives new point to this volume of Mr. Oberholtzer's exhaustive work covering the years dominated by the political reconstruction of the south. For the view of Dunning, that inspired his students for a generation, is here set down. The *Columbia university monographs* have been an endless source for Dr. Oberholtzer; and there has been close kinship because of the agreement

that these years are the end of an epoch — instead of the beginning. Some other writer will one day picture, in as accurate detail as this, the American history of Fish and Phillips, rebuilding the new south as a part of a new nation. There will be no better survey of the standard facts of the era than Mr. Oberholtzer has given.

The four years that are unfolded leisurely throughout this volume are terribly depressing as here displayed. Scandal and malice, incompetence, low ideals, and lower taste are revealed on nearly every page. The high exaltation of war time was followed by a slump in the spirit and personnel of politics. Grant, the war hero, precariously trod the margins that separate honesty and impropriety. His associates, many of them with cynical words in their mouths, rioted in graft and peculation. The victorious party, heir to the war spirit of Lincoln and having no rival with an unstained past, lowered itself to the impeachment of Andrew Johnson and the building of factional political machines. Seven of the eight chapters of this volume deal with this unsavory mess. The eighth selects the Union Pacific railroad as the single non-political topic for extended treatment. The proportions are much the same as those of Rhodes, who gives about 450 pages to the years to which Mr. Oberholtzer allots 614.

The treatment of the greenback movement may be taken for illustration of the author's point of view. Most competent scholars are in agreement that the greenback philosophy was wrong-headed, and would have entailed economic injury to the whole United States as well as a repudiation of sacred obligations. It is not enough, however, for the historian to pass this judgment. To Mr. Oberholtzer greenbackism seems to be a kind of original sin, deliberately chosen by its advocates because it was dishonest. "Herein," he says (page 160), "agitators, seeking to gain the favor and applause of ignorant elements in the population, found their opportunity." He goes on to speak of "men of little property" urged forward by others for "unworthy ends." He fails either to see or to picture the economic entanglements of the south and west that emphasized for these regions the cost entailed by sound finance, and that made it possible for men otherwise intelligent and sincere to convince themselves that greenbacks were consistent with expediency and honor. The kind of history that Professor Buck has written and is writing has failed its mark in Mr. Oberholtzer. Similarly illustrative of the conventionalism of the volume is the fact that it contains no mention of trade unionism or the granger movement, whereas in the first administration of Grant both of these economic forces were diverting political currents from their normal channels, and shaping new ones. Undoubtedly some of these topics have been reserved for treatment in

the next volume, but that postponement leaves the story one-sided and incomplete. There are historians who believe that the beginnings of industrial society in the United States in the years 1865-1873 are in sheer importance more weighty than all the details of reconstruction. One of the great factors in the collapse of political morale that Mr. Oberholtzer so clearly shows, was a deliberate turning of the people from politics to other sorts of social organization as a means of working out their problems. The political history that was vital in the period 1840-1860 ceases to explain the United States after the civil war. And increasingly since that event the historian who would picture America and its motivation must broaden his canvas and increase his themes.

From the point of view that Mr. Oberholtzer has preferred to take, the work is executed with caution, moderation, industry, and fresh scholarship. The new facts and sources hitherto unused serve in most cases to confirm conclusions already reached and widely accepted. In his detailed pictures of men and motives he reaches the highest planes of his historical synthesis. When he presents general principles he is somewhat less successful. If he proceeds with his work at his present pace it is hard to believe that he will not need twelve volumes, instead of the five that he has promised.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON

Life of Roger Brooke Taney, chief justice of the United States supreme court. By Bernard C. Steiner. (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins company, 1922. 553 p. $5.00)

When Chief Justice Taney died in 1864 contemporary opinion, outside of the few who knew and appreciated the truly admirable qualities of the man, connected his name with the Dred Scott decision and its bearing on the controversy which was then merged in the great struggle between the sections. To-day as then it is undoubtedly the nullification of the provision in the Missouri organic act, forbidding slavery in a portion of the Louisiana purchase, which comes to mind when Taney is remembered and, with a large proportion of those to whom the name means anything, little or nothing else is recalled. By presenting a painstaking and impartial account of this really important personage Mr. Steiner has performed a service worthy of attention. Nothing valuable as a biography has hitherto been available, for Samuel Tyler's volume, published in 1872, can stand merely as an example of the prevailing eulogistic "life" of the period.

The work in its first two chapters covers Taney's life down to the time he was admitted to the bar in Calvert county, Maryland, and then proceeds chronologically for the most part to treat of him as a member of the Maryland house of delegates, as a lawyer in Calvert county,

Frederick, and Baltimore, as attorney general of the United States, and as chief justice of the supreme court. While the chronological order in general does not obtrude, at least in one instance its subordination to logical sequence would have been preferable; for, in chapter vii, to break the narration of Taney's relation to the United States bank to discuss his other duties as secretary of the treasury does not add to the smoothness of the story.

As might be expected, the high points in the account deal with the bank situation and the Dred Scott case. Taney's influence with Jackson, even before he joined the president's official family as attorney general, as a rule, and particularly in the affair of the bank, is emphasized so that the well established impression of the Marylander's potent part is substantiated. With Taney, in fact, the machinations of the "octopus" of the time was an obsession; for years after he left the cabinet and while he presided over the supreme bench he harked back to the days when the, to him, malign money power of Biddle and his associates threatened to subvert the true functions of the national government. Withal Taney was a federalist of the old school. Mr. Steiner, while telling the story of the advocate as well as that of the judge, finds constantly an opportunity to show that essentially Taney was a follower of the federalism in which he was reared.

Some two-thirds of the book is devoted to Taney the judge. The length of this portion of the life is due in part to, at times, a wearisome detailing of the principal facts connected with all the cases with which the chief justice had direct connection, not alone those which reached the highest court but those arising before the circuit court when Taney was sitting as a member of the bench. Wherever Taney wrote the opinion of the court there is an elaborate abstract of his views; and there is also almost as detailed an account of his dissenting opinions.

Mr. Steiner finds, in common with many of Taney's associates, that his most important work on the bench was his service in standardizing the practice of the court which, under Marshall, had lacked much in this direction. His greatest contribution to jurisprudence was in the case of the *Genesee Chief,* where "the Supreme Court decided, and Taney expressed its opinion, that the admiralty jurisdiction of the United States Courts extends to waters which are navigable, without regard to the ebb and flow of ocean tides."

A full account of the events leading to the case of Dred Scott v. Sanford and an analysis of the various opinions rendered, as well as excerpts which give contemporary views of the disputed issue, make the chapter devoted to this topic one of the valuable contributions of the book. The author, although he believes that Taney made a mistake in

his reasoning, which was based on inadequate grounds, pays a tribute to the honesty and patriotism of the man who dared make it.

In the account of an earlier case (Briscoe v. the Bank of Kentucky) there is some ground for believing that the significance of the issue is overlooked, and that a better proportioned narrative would have emphasized the radical turn which the decision involved (pages 194, 195). In another place, when the case of Luther v. Borden is under discussion, there is found the curious statement that "Luther was one of the insurrectionists, whom Dorr had arrested." Again, in the chapter entitled "The civil war (1861-1864)" one might take exception to the assertion "Lincoln . . . apparently took no notice of [*ex parte* Merryman], a fact which must cause regret as a blemish in the character of the great President."

Mr. Steiner summarizes his own views of Taney when he says (page 541) "Roger Brooke Taney was a clear-thinking, able, high-minded, hot-tempered, narrow, pertinacious, brave, prejudiced man — a devout Christian and a faithful member of the Roman Catholic Church — the Church of his mother . . . He remained a Federalist until his death, loving the Union and never advancing to the position of a Nationalist. He trusted his friends and was not one easily to forgive an adversary. Brought up in a community of slaveholding planters, he might emancipate his own slaves, but could not rid himself of his predilection toward slavery. An ardent politician in his early years, he was able, for the most part to restrain his political feelings after he had ascended the bench, save in one notable instance."

LESTER B. SHIPPEE

Thirty-fifth annual report of the Bureau of American ethnology. In two parts. Part II. (Washington: Government printing office, 1922)

Early history of the Creek Indians and their neighbors. By John R. Swanton. [Smithsonian institution bureau of American ethnology, bulletin number 73] (Washington: Government printing office, 1922. 492 p.)

Northern Ute music. By Frances Densmore. [Smithsonian institution bureau of American ethnology, bulletin number 75] (Washington: Government printing office, 1922. 213 p.)

These late publications of the bureau of ethnology are of especial interest as marking an epoch in the evolution of that agency of information. Part two of the thirty-fifth annual *Report* is made up of more Kwaikiutl stuff by Franz Boas, and has blessed indications of being the last of it. It is quite as far beyond ordinary comprehension as any that preceded it, but if we are really through with it, we may as well forego "thoughts

that breathe and words that burn," and "say it with flowers." I believe lilies of the valley are used on such occasions; so, "Here's lilies for you."

The thirty-sixth annual *Report* is an advance from the ethnologic Cenozoic to the age of man. It is a study of Osage rites and language, by Francis La Flesche, and is of practical value to American students, both as to the subject and its presentation. Its chief linguistic value is in the literal translation of the texts, which is given word by word, as all Indian translations should be given. The American public may rejoice that the "key to pronunciation," at page 304, is almost free from phonetic obscurity, and demonstrates pronunciation by reference to English words. There are a few points at which it might be made clearer to the struggling masses. For example the vowel signs for "exploded *i*," "exploded *e*," and so forth, would be more comprehensible if we were told whether it were a long vowel sound or a short one that exploded. However, in the process of evolution we cannot expect the plumage of a bird of paradise on the archaeopteryx.

Bulletin number 73 — John R. Swantson's study of the *Early history of the Creek Indians* — is a genuine contribution to ethnologic information, subject to criticism only for a defective index. For example, one of the interesting words in his terrain is "Miami," the well-known Florida winter resort. This word has long attracted the attention of students of the Ohio valley, on account of its apparent identity with the tribal name of that region. Some have found it evidence of the origin of the name of the tribe in their Ojibway name, "O-maum-eeg, or People who live on a peninsula." I called attention fifteen years ago to the improbability of the Florida name having any connection with our word, and said that it was "no doubt a corruption of Mayaimi, the name of one of the ancient tribes of that region," and also the name applied to Lake Okeechobee. Mr. Swanton quotes Fontaneda as saying the Lake of Mayaimi is so called "because it is very large," and makes the ingenious suggestion, "Mayaimi recalls Choctaw *maiha,* wide, and *mih,* it is so, it is like that, although *mih* is usually initial in position." (pages 29, 30) In all probability he has struck the real derivation; but neither "Miami," nor "Mayaimi" is mentioned in the index; and my finding of this information, which was of especial interest to me, was wholly accidental, in looking through the book. I have no doubt that the name of the Ohio valley tribe is a corruption of their Delaware name, "*wemiamiki,*" meaning "all beavers," or, figuratively, "all friends."

Bulletin number 75, *Northern Ute music,* appears to be very well done, but I am not competent to discuss it. I have never been privileged to

hear any Indian music that attained the midway standard, or even rivaled jazz. I am willing to admit that it may "have charms to soothe the savage breast," but I could never understand why it should be soothing to a moderately Christian breast, in a reasonably placid state. I pass judgment to those whose ears have been educated.

J. P. Dunn

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

The sixteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association will be held at Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, March 29 to 31, 1923. Jasper Sipes, president of the Oklahoma historical society, Oklahoma City, and Margaret J. Mitchell of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, are chairman and secretary respectively of the committee on local arrangements. The program committee consists of Charles W. Ramsdell of the University of Texas, Austin, chairman, and Arthur C. Cole, Roy Gittinger, Louis Pelzer, George M. Stephenson, and James E. Winston. The president has appointed as the committee on nominations Orin G. Libby of the University of North Dakota, University, chairman, and Frank H. Hodder and John W. Oliver. All of these committees will welcome suggestions from any of the members of the association.

The *Annual report* of the director of the division of economics and history of the Carnegie endowment for international peace contains a report on the social and economic history of the world war prepared by Professor James T. Shotwell.

"Sir Alexander Mackenzie and his influence on the history of the north west" is the title of an article written by Walter N. Sage and published in the *Bulletin* of the department of history and political and economic science in Queen's university of Kingston, Ontario.

The Chicago historical society has recently established the practice of issuing a little leaflet, its *Bulletin,* in which it prints gossip interesting to its members, items about the work of the society and, usually, one or two letters or other documents from its collections.

"The trend of the direct primary," discussed by Ralph S. Boots in the August issue of the *American political science review,* is a subject of peculiar interest to the people of this country and particularly to those west of the Alleghany mountains, where the device has perhaps had its most extensive as well as longest trial.

In the *William and Mary college quarterly* for July, 1922, there are printed a few Preston letters from the collection which has been drawn upon by this periodical before. Among them is one written from Lex-

ington in 1793 by John Preston to his brother Francis; it contains some interesting comment on the troubled political situation in the old southwest in the days before the union had demonstrated its stability.

Otto A. Rothert, secretary of the Filson club, has prepared a useful little handbook called *The Filson club and its activities, 1884-1922,* containing, as the subtitle goes on to explain, "a history of the Filson club, including lists of Filson club publications and papers on Kentucky history prepared for the club." The book is issued by the club as publication number 32.

Following its custom the *Political science quarterly* prints as a *Supplement* to its September, 1922, issue a "Record of political events from July 1, 1921, to June 30, 1922," prepared by Harry J. Carman and Elmer D. Graper. In the regular number the two articles most interesting to the student of western history are "The new normal in foreign trade," by H. R. Mussey, and "The supreme court's review of legislation," by T. R. Powell.

The greater portion of the *Hispanic American historical review* for August, 1922, is devoted to an account of "Anglo-Spanish relations in America in the closing years of the colonial era," written by Vera Lee Brown. The monograph covers the years from 1763 to 1774, and is based largely on material found in the various archives of London. The student of the history of the Mississippi valley will find much of interest in the contribution.

Territorial governor Robert Lucas and Iowa in the days when he was its chief executive afford topics for a large part of the *Palimpsest* for August, 1922, to which John C. Parish, the editor, contributes the first two articles. Bruce E. Mahan tells about "Three early taverns," of Bloomington, now Muscatine, Iowa. The number for September is devoted to the Trappists, with four studies by Bruce E. Mahan: "A day at New Melleray," "The Trappists in Europe," "The abbey in Iowa," and "The life of the Trappists."

No issue of the *Register of the Kentucky state historical society* would be complete without a contribution from Dr. Jillson. The number for September, 1922, has from his pen "The Big Sandy valley, a regional history prior to 1850," with a bibliography of materials available on the topic. Other articles of this issue are "Captain James Harrod's company," by Lucien Beckner, "The Quarles family and their Woodford connections," by William E. Railey, "Captain Lewis Rose," by Carrie W. Van Arsdell, and "James Guthrie — Kentuckian, 1792-1869," by Robert S. Cotterill.

Following a paper in an earlier number of the *Georgia historical quarterly* in which the agriculture of Georgia north of the fall line was discussed, Dr. Roland M. Harper takes up the "Development of agriculture in lower Georgia from 1850 to 1880" in the issue of June, 1922. In some degree this account of Georgia's cotton belt in its general features casts light on the economic life of the states to the west, where similarities of topography and climate tended to bring about like institutions and development.

The July, 1922, issue of the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* is primarily a Grant number. A full account of the Grant celebration at Point Pleasant, Clermont county, is contributed by C. B. Galbreath, who weaves into his narrative the substance if not a verbatim report of the speeches made upon the occasion. Non-Grant articles include the story of "Catherine Gougar," by Dr. Frank Warner, and "Ohio and western expansion," by Willis Arden Chamberlain. Professor Chamberlain's article will doubtless be in considerable demand from chambers of commerce and similar organizations in Ohio.

In the *Iowa journal of history and politics* for July, 1922, Erik McKinley Eriksson has a contribution on "Sioux City and the Black hills gold rush, 1874-1877." "A typical Iowa pioneer community," (Carlisle) is the subject of an address delivered at the dedication of the public park in Carlisle by George F. Parker and printed in this number of the *Journal*. The topic of "Iowa troops in the Sully campaigns" is presented by some contemporary evidence in the form of an extract from the diary of Henry J. Wieneke, some manuscripts, mostly letters, of Amos R. Cherry, and a letter of Josiah F. Hill.

In the *Canadian historical review* for September, 1922, is to be found a paper by Gilbert E. Jackson entitled "Wheat and the trade cycle," which may be read with as much profit by those who study phases of economic history in the United States as by the dwellers of the Dominion. The other contributions to this issue are more strictly Canadian in their bearing, being "The Canadian historical association," by James F. Kenny, "The noblesse of Canada," by Captain Charles E. Lart, and "The Mistery of Walker's ear," a story of the troubled days in Montreal after the English had assumed control in 1764, by A. L. Burt.

The *American economic review* for September, 1922, contains as a memorial to Henry C. Adams, a former president of the American economic association, a number of tributes paid this distinguished scholar by friends and associates at the meeting held at Pittsburgh in December,

1921. Not only the economist, but the historian and political scientist as well are indebted to this great teacher, so long connected with the University of Michigan, and public man, whose work, both as a writer and member of the interstate commerce commission, has unquestionably had much influence in American thought and life.

One more reminder that Missouri has recently celebrated the centennial of her entrance into the union is found in the *Missouri historical quarterly* for July, 1922, in the first instalment of "A century of Missouri art," by J. S. Ankeney. Other articles in this number are "Wheat raising in pioneer Missouri," by Asbury Good-Knight, "The influence of population movements on Missouri before 1861," by William O. Lynch, "Missourians abroad — Winston Churchill," by J. Breckenridge Ellis, "Arius, the Libyan," by Walter B. Stevens, "Pioneer life in southwest Missouri," by Wiley Britton, and another contribution by William G. Bek on "The followers of Duden."

Under the title "Points in Illinois history — a symposium," the editor of the *Illinois Catholic historical review,* for April, 1922, propounds a series of "mooted questions" relating to early Illinois history and prints several letters in which students of this field give their views of the topics. "Catholic education in Illinois," by Helen M. Larkin; "The early days of St. Joseph's college, Bardstown, Ky.," by W. J. Howlett; "The Illinois part of the diocese of Vincennes," by Joseph J. Thompson; "John Lancaster Spalding — early years in the priesthood," by J. B. Culemans; "Notre Dame — antecedents and development," by Harry W. Flannery; and "Planting the cross," by J. J. Thompson, are the other leading articles.

In the *Tennessee historical magazine* for April, 1921 (issued in June, 1922), Dr. George F. Mellen pays a tribute to "Calvin Morgan McClung," and includes an account of the collection left by Mr. McClung to the Lawson McGhee library at Knoxville. The collection contains much material on southern history and genealogy and especially on Tennessee history. In addition to the numerous books, some of them very rare items, there are mauscripts and maps of great value. Other articles in the *Magazine* are "The Natchez trace," by R. S. Cotterill; "The boyhood of President Polk," by A. V. Goodpasture; and "The battle of King's mountain," by Samuel C. Williams.

The January, 1921, *Journal of the Illinois state historical society* contains a copy of a letter probably written by Senator Doolittle in 1884 together with some correspondence which passed between Mr.

Duane Mowry, the editor, and Robert T. Lincoln, to whom the letter was addressed. Another source contribution in this number is "The Indian war of 1876, from letters of Lieut. Thaddeus H. Capron," prepared by Cynthia J. Capron. Other articles include "Dr. David Nelson and his times," by W. A. Richardson, Jr.; "Congregational church, Toulon, Illinois, 1846-1921," by Clare McKenzie; and "Two pioneer doctors of Stark county, Illinois" (Thomas Hall and Alfred Castle), by William R. Sandham.

This past summer the Minnesota historical society inaugurated a new policy of holding formal meetings at places other than St. Paul by convening at Duluth on July 28 and 29. Among the papers and discussions were those contributed by Mr. S. J. Buck, the superintendent, Professor Clarence W. Alvord, of the University of Minnesota, Mr. Franklin F. Holbrook, of the Minnesota war records commission, and Mr. W. E. Culkin, chairman of the St. Louis county branch of the war records commission. In addition to the formal exercises in Duluth there was an excursion to Grand Portage and old Fort Charlotte, two places which, together with the old portage trail, it is hoped will be made a state reservation before it is too late to preserve an interesting memorial of fur-trading days.

The last number of volume 5 of the *Wisconsin magazine of history,* June, 1922, has another of the chapters of General King's "Memories of a busy life," "Marshall Mason Strong, Racine pioneer," by Eugene Walter Leach, "The first traders of Wisconsin," by Louise P. Kellogg, and an account of the lost village of the Mascouten as one of the "Historic spots in Wisconsin," by W. A. Titus. For documents this issue of the *Magazine* has "Charles Minton Baker's journal from Vermont to Wisconsin," and some "Letters of George B. Smith," likewise descriptive of a journey to Wisconsin. The *Magazine* starts its sixth volume, September, 1922, with a number containing a continuation of General King's "Memories of a busy life," and papers by D. J. Gardner on "Incidents in the early history of Wisconsin lead mines;" by Truman O. Douglass on "Platteville in its first quarter century;" by Maria Greene Douglass on "Personal recollections of Platteville;" and by Angie Kumlien Main entited "By the waters of Turtle lake." For a document the *Magazine* prints the first instalment of a diary written by Frederick J. Starin during the course of a journey from Montgomery county in New York to Milwaukee and various other places in Wisconsin. The trip was taken in 1840. There is also printed a letter written by Senator James R. Doolittle to C. A. Dana in 1880 and dealing largely with political affairs.

The last International congress of historical studies, held in London in April, 1913, voted that the next should be held in St. Petersburg in April, 1918, but no such meeting has occurred in these nine years. It is now arranged that such a congress shall be held at Brussels, April 8-15, 1923, under the patronage of the King of the Belgians. The invitations are sent out by the Royal academy of Belgium; Professor Henri Pirenne is president of the committee of organization, Father Hippolyte Delehaye, S. J., and Professor Franz Cumont the vice-presidents; the address of the secretary is, Dr. F. L. Ganshof, 12 rue Jacques Jordaens, Brussels. Provision has been made for thirteen sections, representing the various divisions and aspects of history, and for coöperation, by committees in many lands, in the work of organization. The president of the American historical association has appointed a committee to act for it in making such preparations as may be requisite for participation by historical scholars in the United States. It consists of J. F. Jameson, chairman, Clarence W. Alvord, Carl R. Fish, Tenney Frank, Waldo G. Leland, James T. Shotwell, and Paul Van Dyke. The chairman would be glad to receive the names of any persons who think of attending, and to supply desired information. The fee for membership is fifty Belgian francs.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. IX, NO. 4 MARCH, 1923

OLD FRANKLIN: A FRONTIER TOWN OF THE TWENTIES[1]

The scene is the northern bank of the Missouri river opposite the present town of Boonville, on a Friday morning late in May, 1819. Here on the water front of Franklin — or "Old Franklin," as it is more commonly known — were assembled several hundred of the inhabitants to greet the little steamboat *Independence,* the first to ascend the Missouri. They greeted it with loud huzzas and a "Federal salute." The editor of the *Missouri Intelligencer and Boonslick Advertiser,* the local paper barely a month old, in his issue of the day voices the community's rejoicing over this seeming solution of its key problem of transportation. The bustling town must have been a welcome sight to the captain and the passengers after their thirteen-day trip from St. Louis. After passing the border of settled area some fifty miles above St. Charles, they had steamed for nearly a hundred miles through a wilderness broken only by hamlets at the mouths of the Osage and the Gasconade until they had come to the scattered outlying farms of the Boonslick country some forty miles below Franklin.[2]

Franklin, when Long's expedition visited it in July, 1819, was a town of "about one hundred and twenty log houses of one story, several framed dwellings of two stories, and two of brick,

[1] This paper was read at the fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at Iowa City on May 12, 1922. No attempt has been made to give exact references for every statement in the article; indeed, because of its nature this would hardly be possible. But the general sources of information have been indicated and specific references have been given for facts which may be of interest to other investigators.

[2] *Account of an expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky mountains performed in the years 1819, 1820. . . . under the command of Maj. S. H. Long (Early western travels, 1748-1846,* vol. 14, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites — Cleveland, 1905), 1:121-148.

thirteen shops for sale of merchandise, four taverns, two smiths' shops, two large team-mills, two billiard rooms, a court house, a log prison of two stories, a post office, and a printing press issuing a weekly paper."[3] Less than three years before, the commissioners had located here, on a squatter's farm, the county seat of Howard county. The next February (1817) a post office was established and in July the circuit court, assured that an adequate jail had been erected, moved across the river from Cole's Fort. There were difficulties over land titles and the real development of the town dates from 1818. John M. Peck[4] on his visit in December, 1818, found seventy families in Franklin — four or five hundred people, perhaps; Long's description would seem to imply that there was a population of from six to eight hundred; in December, 1819,[5] a local writer estimated the population at over one thousand. But the panic of 1819 hit the town hard. Another local writer in January, 1823,[6] mentions two hundred buildings and nearly a thousand inhabitants. This figure was probably approximately correct until the beginning of the decline of the town in 1826.

This rapid growth of a full-fledged town on the very edge of the frontier was, of course, an incident in the wave of migration to the Boonslick country, to the Missouri river country west of Jefferson City. When the settlers in the Boonslick came out of their five forts or stockades in the spring of 1816,[7] there were not over five hundred whites in all central Missouri,[8] and these were chiefly in the present counties of Cooper and Howard, within twenty-five miles of Franklin. The territorial census of 1818 gives 3,386 white males — perhaps 6,500 of both sexes; in 1820 the national census reveals 17,629 white people. Except for the ephemeral town of Chariton thirty miles up the river,[9] Franklin had a monopoly of the trade of this rapidly growing district.

[3] *Account of an expedition under Maj. S. H. Long* (Thwaites, ed.), 148.

[4] Rufus Babcock, *Forty years of pioneer life. Memoir of John Mason Peck, D.D., edited from his journals and correspondence* (Philadelphia, [1864]), 134.

[5] *Missouri Intelligencer and Boonslick Advertiser,* April 1, 1820, in the library of the State historical society of Missouri at Columbia.

[6] *Ibid.,* January 7, 1823.

[7] *Ibid.,* April 1, 1820.

[8] *Ibid.,* January 7, 1823.

[9] *Account of an expedition under Maj. S. H. Long* (Thwaites, ed.), 1:158; *Missouri Intelligencer,* April 1, 1820.

It was the seat of government of all the Boonslick country from 1816 to 1818 and of the most populous part, that north of the river, from 1818 to 1820. Here was the only United States land office from 1818 to 1824. Franklin was the gateway to the Boonslick El Dorado for those coming by keel boat or over the Boonslick trail from St. Charles.

As the point of the wedge of settled area moved rapidly up the Missouri Franklin lost its monopolistic advantages. Howard county was reduced to its present boundaries in 1820 and the seat of government was transferred to Fayette in 1824.[10] New towns served as local trade centers: Columbia, laid out in 1820; Liberty and Lexington, in 1822; and Richmond and Independence, in 1827. A second land office was opened at Lexington in 1824.[11] But, on the other hand, Franklin's immediate metropolitan district, which included Cooper and Howard counties, was increasing rapidly in population and in purchasing power, and the population was passing out of the earlier pioneer stage and turning to tobacco growing. A very important substitute for Franklin's earlier monopolistic advantage was the rapid development of the Santa Fe trade, for which Franklin was the rendezvous and outfitting point. Altogether the picture seems to be, at least until 1826, that of a town with its total population somewhat fixed, and with changing interests but continued prosperity. Franklin continued to be the largest and the wealthiest town west of St. Charles, but its prospects for any rapid or considerable growth were already dim when the high waters of 1826 gave warning of its fate three years later.

The ground plan of Franklin as it took final form in 1819 covered about two-thirds of a square mile.[12] It was the familiar checkerboard pattern, divided into fifteen blocks along the river and ten blocks deep by streets from sixty-six to one hundred feet wide — "streets" unmarked and unimproved. The ninety-seven in-lots of the plat of 1816 had grown to six hundred and seventy-eight. The heart of the town[13] was the "first Main

[10] *Ibid.*, November 25, 1823.

[11] Records of the county court of Howard county, 3:31, in the courthouse at Fayette, Missouri.

[12] The original plat of Franklin and the plats of the additions are in the Record of deeds, Howard county, book C, 126, 309, 455, 462, in the courthouse at Fayette.

[13] The following description of the town is built up from the advertisements in

Street," leading from the river to the public square, the square itself, and a block or two on each of its four sides. On the west side of the square was the two-story log jail, built in 1817 at a cost of $1,199; on the southwest corner was the brick market house; out in the square was the public well and, probably, the temporary three-hundred-dollar courthouse. The square and Main street must have been built up nearly solidly, as the lots were subdivided into frontages of forty or even twenty feet. The buildings were, for the most part, one-story, one- or two-room log cabins, with occasional two-story frame buildings. "The" brick store and "the" white building recurring frequently in the advertisements speak eloquently of the general type. The square and Main street were given over chiefly to the stores and shops, which were usually single rooms with frequently a storehouse in the rear. The lawyers, the doctors, the taverns, and the printing house were within a block or two. Along the water front were two ferries and the warehouses. Scattered around this nucleus were the dwellings.

The stores, or "shops for merchandising," were general stores in the broadest meaning of the word. In the long lists of wares in their advertisements the finer sorts of textiles, hardware, building materials, and household furnishings perhaps figure most prominently, though hardly a list omits whisky, while the grocery and liquor shops carried a side line of general merchandise. The thirteen shops of Long's visit had shrunk to five in 1823, but these were fairly permanent establishments. Besides the dramshops there were other more specialized stores and shops, some rather surprising in a frontier town. There was a goldsmith and watch repairer as well as a long succession of tailors. The latter emphasize their skill in military uniforms and their wide experience, one boasting of a residence in forty-two cities of Europe, of five years in New York and Philadelphia, and of two in Lexington, Kentucky. Perhaps it is unnecessary to add that he was an Irishman! As early as 1819 Franklin could boast of a barber who also made cigars. The bakery and confectionery shops dealt largely in liquors, cordials, and bottled claret and Madeira.

the *Missouri Intelligencer*, descriptions of lots in the Record of deeds, and hints in the records of the circuit and county courts.

One of the stores of 1819, that of Sanguinet and Bright, was a branch of the St. Louis firm of the same name. There are scattered references, particularly in the earlier years, to St. Louis financial interests in other stores, through either a resident partner or a hired agent. As late as 1827 a new firm appears whose senior partner was a resident of Philadelphia. On the other hand, some of the local stores followed trade westward to the new towns. The Lammes in 1829 had branch stores in Columbia, Liberty, and Independence.

While the merchants, of course, were most numerous in the columns of the newspaper, in Franklin, as ever on the frontier, the most universal occupation was trading and speculating in land. Nearly every man of capital or credit was buying or trading town lots or farm land. The professional trader was much in evidence. Several of the Rector clan so powerful in Missouri and Illinois and later in Arkansas were in and around Franklin. Taylor Berry, who held up the state of Missouri for four thousand dollars for what later proved to be an invalid claim to the site of Jefferson City, came to Franklin in 1819 and later, after being indicted for perjury and forgery, was killed in a duel with the circuit attorney.[14] The record of deeds shows that during the boom the St. Louis speculators were heavily interested in Franklin real estate, as were individuals in Kentucky and Cincinnati.

A very cursory examination of the record of deeds, in spite of uncertainties as to the improvements on the lots, reveals the enormous increase in Franklin land values up to the time of the panic. In the original sale in 1816 eighty-seven lots seem to have brought around $2,000. In 1817 a half-acre lot fronting on the square sold for $200, but in February, 1818, one-half of the same lot brought the same sum. By June, 1818, a lot a block from the square brought $300, while by November lots twelve blocks from the square were sold for $333. The highest prices noted were $1,350 for a half-acre lot on the square in December, 1818; $1,200 for a frontage of thirty feet on the square and eighty feet deep, but including "the" white building, early in 1819; and $1,000 for a lot one block from the square, one hundred and seventy-two feet by forty feet, in July, 1819.

[14] *Missouri Intelligencer*, September 18, 1824.

But the panic ruined the majority of the promoters and large land owners, the real estate market was paralyzed, and prices never regained these high levels.

Franklin had a considerable amount of small-scale industry or manufacturing, stimulated by the high costs of transportation. One of the two mills of 1819 was a considerable plant, including both a sawmill and a gristmill, requiring twelve yoke of oxen for motive power, and valued at over ten thousand dollars when it was burned in 1821. There was a brickyard somewhere on the outskirts of town and there was also a wool-carding machine to prepare the rolls for the spinning wheel. The cheapness of furs explains the presence of hat manufactories. Shoemakers, saddlers, cabinetmakers, and potters all supplied local needs. The blacksmiths were also makers of hoes and the like and of nails, and they used considerable quantities of the more easily transported bar and scrap iron. There was usually a tinware and copper "factory" in town, largely interested in mash kettles and stills. Distilling seems to have been almost a household industry. The tobacco manufactory, with its varieties of chewing tobacco and cigars, and the ropewalk, both established in 1823, were the two industries which clearly looked beyond a local market. The tobacco factory, which also exported the leaf, had its wares on sale at St. Louis and the ropewalk hoped to develop an export trade.

Skilled labor, as ever on the frontier, was scarce, irresponsible, and hard to hold off the land. Most of the local industries advertised at one time or another for apprentices; the court regularly bound out needy orphans and dependents. Even the apprentices ran away — among them Kit Carson,[15] who found the saddler's trade too tame for his adventurous spirit. There were negro slaves in the Boonslick as early as 1814;[16] slaves figure frequently in inventories of estates and in the advertising columns of the paper. Where qualifications are mentioned, domestic service is most common, though woodchoppers, general farmworkers, and blacksmiths are occasionally specified. The hiring of slaves, especially from executors of estates, was very

[15] *Missouri Intelligencer*, October 12, 1826.

[16] Settlement of the estate of Sarshell Cooper, killed in 1814, in Records of the circuit court, 1:169.

common and there seems to have been some feeling against the selling of slaves. The holdings were small, rarely more than three or four. As fourteen and three-fifths per cent of the population of all Howard county in the census of 1820 were slaves, it seems conservative to estimate that they comprised twenty per cent of the population of Franklin.

But one must not get too cosmopolitan a picture of Franklin. The high hopes of that May morning of 1819 were not realized. Save for Long's expedition and the government boats supplying Council Bluffs, there is no record of further steamboats at Franklin until 1826[17] and 1828.[18] Not until 1829,[19] the year Old Franklin was abandoned, was there an attempt to maintain a regular packet service with St. Louis. As late as 1819 immigrants were still rowing, poling, cordeling, and even sailing their keel boats up the Missouri. The merchants brought in their supplies semiannually by the same laborious method throughout the twenties. But in 1816 the circuit court authorized the laying out of a "road" to St. Charles, over which the great bulk of immigration came in. Cattle, too, were driven overland from Kentucky for sale. The weekly or fortnightly mails were extremely irregular, especially in the winter and spring. Old Franklin did not hear of the first Missouri compromise until a month after its passage. A stage line to St. Charles was proposed in 1819, was unsuccessfully attempted in 1821, and was finally established in 1824.[20] The stage left St. Louis at four o'clock on Sunday morning and arrived at Franklin at seven o'clock on Tuesday evening. The lawyers and the land traders visited St. Louis and Kentucky, the merchants occasionally went east to New York or to Pennsylvania for supplies, but the contacts of the ordinary citizen with the outside world were few.

Banking facilities were utterly lacking and currency was chronically short. The advertisements show that, however they fought against it, the merchants were forced to do much of their trading by barter for salt pork, beef, tallow, beeswax, and, later, tobacco. During the hard times there was a sentiment that the

[17] *Missouri Intelligencer,* April 14, 1826.
[18] *Ibid.,* March 14, 1828.
[19] *Ibid.,* July 31, 1829.
[20] *Ibid,* June 12, 1824.

merchants had no right to drain the country of money but that they were obligated to serve as exporters. The merchants of Franklin in turn tried to boycott the loan office certificates. There was probably a large amount of truth in the naïve lament in 1821 that formerly the immigrants had supplied the cash for the district, but that the panic of 1819 had cut off this source of supply. The lack of any banking facilities was a special hardship to the receiver of the Franklin land office. At the height of the boom, from October 1, 1818, to September 30, 1819, he took in over half a million dollars.[21] All the cash that he did not turn over to the army paymaster for the post at Council Bluffs he was forced to ship to St. Louis or, after the suspension of the Bank of Missouri in 1821, to Louisville or New Orleans banks.[22]

The advantages of a staple money crop, nonperishable, early turned attention to tobacco. The first shipment from the Boonslick in 1822[23] brought a good price at New Orleans, a tobacco warehouse and a factory were established at Franklin, and in 1824 thirty-eight hogsheads from Franklin topped the New York market. Boonslick salt was a standard brand, but it figures surprisingly little in the records. After 1821 the Santa Fe trade was an increasingly important factor in the economic life of the town, probably a chief reason for Franklin's continued prosperity. At Franklin was organized the first expedition; the merchants laid in goods, chiefly textiles, especially designed for the trade, and the traders brought back horses, mules, jennets and jacks, and furs and silver. As early as 1822 the gross returns of the Franklin group of adventurers were estimated at ten thousand dollars.[24] But the Santa Fe trade is a study in itself.

The Missouri was a far better way out of the country than in; until the steamers came it was largely a one-way road. The Boonslick farmers floated their salt pork and beef, lard and tallow, salt and, later, tobacco down to New Orleans, as many of them had done earlier in Kentucky. The Franklin merchants

[21] *American state papers: finance,* 3:431.

[22] General T. A. Smith papers, in the State historical society of Missouri.

[23] *Missouri Intelligencer,* November 5, 1822.

[24] *Ibid.,* February 18, 1823.

were active in this export trade, shipping the goods they had taken in barter, contracting for pork for export, or transporting and selling on commission. The most ambitious attempt to organize the export trade was the formation of the Missouri Exporting company, a coöperative project with an authorized capital of twenty thousand dollars and a paid manager. It got as far as advertising for bids on eight flatboats, but there the information ends.[25]

By origin of its population and social customs, Old Franklin was a bit of the Kentucky river valley transplanted to the far west. There were individual Irish, French, and Pennsylvania Dutch; the editor was born in Roxbury, Massachusetts, and was always somewhat of a Yankee; piedmont Virginia and Tennessee were well represented; but the mass of the population were Kentuckians. Many of them were substantial persons of some means who brought slaves, blooded stock, and considerable cash with them. In fact this older part of the Boonslick did not pass through the earlier well-defined stages of frontier development but offers more analogies to the settlement of the cotton belt in Alabama and Tennessee. The young men revisited Kentucky frequently, the local paper carried quite as much Kentucky as Missouri news, and an occasional student went back to Transylvania. The bonds weakened after the first few years, but Franklin was loyal to Clay to the end.

As in St. Louis, the uncertainties as to land titles reënforced the lure of frontier opportunities and drew a group of ambitious young lawyers. There seem to have been two already at Cole's Fort who crossed the river when the town was opened. By 1819 there were eight more and others came later. All were land traders and some were interested also in merchandising. They seem to have set the social tone of the town; they drank, gambled, raced horses, and made speeches. But the community leadership and political offices went rather to the substantial men of property, often first comers who had been shrewd enough to utilize their opportunities. There was an unusual percentage of men of education outside of the professions.

When the *Intelligencer* raises the curtain on Old Franklin in 1819 there were two doctors practicing and a third was keeping a

[25] *Ibid.*, October 29, December 11, 1822.

general store. Two more came in 1820 and more came and went in later years. Franklin had a bad reputation for health, which was probably deserved, with its low-lying site and its constant stream of immigrants. Dr. Lowry in 1820 contributed to the paper three articles [26] on the prevailing autumn fevers, presumably typhoid, which evidence some medical training. His treatment was bleeding and cathartics; he speaks of calomel almost with affection and glows over its gentle stimulating quality. Dr. Lowry was a leader in the community and later a member of the legislature. Vaccine and vaccination figure in the doctors' advertisements from the beginning. There was actually a dentist in Franklin in 1824. The doctors were frankly willing to accept all sorts of produce for their services.

No church building or organized church appears in the record before 1826. There are vague references to a meetinghouse in 1827 and 1829. By 1821 a branch of the American Bible society had been organized. [27] Preaching by the circuit riders or missionary clergymen was fairly frequent at the courthouse or in private houses. John M. Peck visited Franklin again in 1824. [28] In the earlier days most of the marriages were performed by a local justice of the peace.

Many men later prominent in Missouri history tarried a longer or a shorter time in our town. Four [29] of the lawyers were later judges of the supreme court and one [30] of them was Missouri's war-time governor. Two other future governors kept store there for a time [31] and a fourth was register in the land office.[32] Both Benton and Barton visited Franklin on their campaign tours. William H. Ashley was a familiar figure on his trips to and from his rendezvous with his Rocky mountain hunters. Occasionally an army officer at Council Bluffs left his family in Franklin. The Santa Fe trade brought at least one Mexican don. In spite of its isolation, life in Franklin lacked much of the sordid drabness of the frontier.

[26] *Missouri Intelligencer,* November 4, 11, 18, 1820.
[27] *Ibid.,* June 25, 1821.
[28] *Ibid.,* September 18, 1824.
[29] George Tompkins, Hamilton R. Gamble, John F. Ryland, and Abiel Leonard.
[30] Hamilton R. Gamble.
[31] Lillburn W. Boggs and Claiborne F. Jackson.
[32] John Miller.

Hunting in a country where the bear and the wolf had not been exterminated and where venison hams were articles of trade, and bee-hunting [33] when both beeswax and honey were staples combined recreation and profit. One may infer the normal amount of hard drinking and gambling: on one occasion most of the lawyers attending the circuit court were indicted for gaming and were fined five dollars apiece. There was always a billiard table in town. But to these true Kentuckians horse-racing was *the* sport. There was a mile track outside of town as early as 1819. In 1823 a three-day race meet was held under Lexington Jockey club rules. Thoroughbred horses with elaborate pedigrees were offered for sale or for service.

Franklin maintained one and sometimes two companies of militia, commissions in which were eagerly sought. The annual musters were the occasions of keen electioneering on state issues. In May, 1822, Union Masonic lodge number seven was installed [34] and thereafter twice a year it celebrated the festivals of St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist with a sermon or an oration followed by a banquet.

The banquet was the characteristic community function to celebrate Washington's birthday or the Fourth or any unusual occurrence such as the arrival of the first steamboat or the passage of the Missouri compromise, or to do honor to a visiting notable. The banquet was a formally organized affair, with a chairman and a vice chairman, formal toasts, and an indeterminate number of toasts made by volunteers. Twenty or thirty toasts heartily responded to must have taxed even frontier capacity. Perhaps the editor's frequent assurance that the utmost harmony and decorum prevailed was not entirely supererogatory.

Franklin seems to have been a law-abiding community, even when one takes into consideration the editor's frank suppression of unpleasant incidents and the reluctance of the frontiersman to appeal to the courts. There was one shooting affair in which one prominent young man killed another. Only on the third presentment did the grand jury find a true bill and a trial jury promptly brought in an acquittal. The entire community took

[33] *Missouri Intelligencer,* September 21, October 19, 1826.
[34] *Ibid.,* May 14, 1822.

sides in this affair but no feud developed.[35] There was one duel, fought, however, over the line in Illinois. In 1824, for what appears to have been a deliberate murder, the offender was convicted and hanged — and he had been a man of some prominence. Street fights were not unknown and occasionally there were more serious disturbances. The government boatmen on their way to Council Bluffs had a final spree in town one Saturday night in 1822 and tried to destroy the jail. Instead, the citizens caught seventeen of them and put them inside. The following Sunday was clearly a rather hectic day in Franklin. The same crowd, reënforced by returning soldiers, caused a similar disturbance on their return.

Except for a patrol system to keep the negroes home at night, the town had no police system. The governing body was the five trustees, who had very vague powers and who are rarely mentioned. The second disturbance in 1822 led to two mass meetings and to the decision to petition the legislature for incorporation and a more efficient town government, but nothing came of it. With unwonted energy the trustees in 1819 had laid down elaborate rules for the sale of country produce in the market house and on the streets. They had also organized a fire company, and every male between the ages of sixteen and forty-five must turn out with a bucket. The supplementary volunteer company was to be provided with four fire hooks with which to tear down buildings, two ladders, four axes, and numerous officers. The trustees had charge of the streets and the public well, and they did not give satisfaction. The county court was clearly the important governmental organization.

The intellectual life of the town, as always, is revealed only in tantalizing glimpses. An academy had been incorporated in 1820[36] but it probably was not fully organized until 1826.[37] Several itinerant teachers issued their prospectuses in 1820 and 1821, but the first real school seems to have been opened in the latter year by Jonathan S. Findlay, brother of the governor of Penn-

[35] Richard Gentry shot Henry Carroll. The editor barely mentions the incident and ignores the trial. But when in 1824, four years later, Gentry, who had moved to Columbia, was a candidate for the legislature, Carroll's friends presented their side at great length in the *Intelligencer*.

[36] Missouri, *Territorial laws*, 1:654.

[37] *Missouri Intelligencer*, August 5, 1826.

sylvania. Findlay was a delegate to the convention of 1820 and formerly had been a large land owner, but he was ruined in the panic. In 1823 there were two schools, for both sexes, in which the primary branches and, for an extra fee, geography and history were taught. Findlay's maximum quarterly charge for tuition, board, and washing was forty dollars.

The Franklin Library company in 1819 had a room, and its librarian, Dr. Lowry, had the usual difficulty in securing the return of borrowed books. The company wound up its affairs in 1822 and was succeeded by the "Public Library." A list of their books would be invaluable. Scattered references reveal the presence in town of Volney's *Ruins,* Burns's poems, the works of Shakespeare, *Peregrine Pickle,* Junius' *Letters,* Gregory's *Economy,* and the *Heathen mythology.* Franklin was by no means a bookless town.

The local newspaper was of a high order of excellence for the time and was known throughout the United States as the westernmost paper. The editor had a large exchange list; on one occasion, after a banking up of the mail, he complacently notes the receipt at one time of one hundred and thirteen papers from nineteen states and three from England, the latter received through his Boston correspondent. The St. Louis and Washington papers had a limited circulation in Franklin and items from the *Intelligencer* were reprinted in the eastern press. Its columns carried the usual number of open letters on political and economic issues, often rewritten by the editor; some of these letters, as those of Duff Green of Chariton, were able and incisive. Patten found room for communications on Sabbath observance, on the history of writing, on "diophantine" algebra,[38] and on the history of the Bible, and he reluctantly sold space[39] to John Hardeman, an advanced deist who raised rare fruits, vegetables, and flowers on his show place near town.

Of strictly literary efforts the most ambitious were the eleven articles written in the summer of 1821 by the "Occidentalist."[40] Much in the manner of "The Spectator" the author attempts, with only moderate success, to point out with kindly advice and

[38] *Ibid.,* September 2, 1823, March 10, May 15, 1824.
[39] *Ibid.,* October 7, 1823, September 18, 1824.
[40] *Ibid.,* May 14, 1821, and following issues.

satire the weaknesses in the manners and morals of the town. Unfortunately, literary style seemed more essential to him than did the picture. There is a very valuable series of historical sketches and a description of the Boonslick country, county by county, in 1822-1823.[41] Alphonso Wetmore, paymaster in the United States army, contributed a most interesting sketch of Mike Shuck, the beaver hunter,[42] a real character of the extreme frontier type who was in and out of Franklin; four lively pieces on the Franklin races; and an occasional poem.

And the poems! Perhaps one-fourth of the issues carried original verses, a few of which have some real interest. There are political songs, poems of occasion, and satirical pieces. But most of the poems reflect a sad, sad world of vain and fleeting show and blighted love. The muse is not merely sad and pensive; she is dull and sodden. One poem is entitled "To a faded wild rose," written by a young lady "who blooms again beyond the tomb."

Franklin, then, was throughout its brief career rather a transplanted, exotic growth, the product of temporary advantages — in many ways in the far west rather than of it. Its ending, too, had in it some element of romance. Just as Independence was beginning to supplant it in the Santa Fe trade, Franklin's one remaining special asset, the erratic Missouri swept the town out of existence. The encroachments began apparently in the unusually high waters of 1826, when the paper was removed to Fayette. By 1828 the situation was so serious that the community decided to move bodily two miles or so to the present town of New Franklin. In 1828-1829 as buildings were completed there the transfer was made and the old town fell into the river. But later the Missouri shifted back to the southward and rebuilt the original site of the town. Barring the timber and the railroad, the bottom lands opposite Boonville are to-day substantially as they were in 1816. The cycle is complete; the original graveyard is the only tangible trace of Old Franklin.

Jonas Viles

University of Missouri
Columbia

[41] *Missouri Intelligencer,* November 20, 1822, and following issues.
[42] *Ibid.,* October 29, 1822, February 11, 1823.

KENTUCKY NEUTRALITY IN 1861[1]

The editor of the *Daily Louisville Democrat*, in the issue of January 24, 1861, wrote: "The historian will record the events of 1860 and 1861, in the United States, with wonder and astonishment. What a revolution, and for what reasons! He will look over the past history of this country, its prosperity and glory, and ask what rational account can be given of the sudden disintegration of the great Republic, which seemed, but a short time before, destined to immortality. He will look in vain for any justifiable excuse even for the extraordinary conduct of men."

This quotation reflects in large measure the attitude of the majority of Kentuckians of that time toward the great events that were then taking place.[2] Kentucky had the same domestic institutions as the cotton states and was, like them, exasperated by the course events were taking. On the other hand, Kentuckians were sincerely attached to the union, as they understood it, and wished to have it maintained. Thinking men could see that, unless something was done immediately to check the movement toward disunion, the people of the United States were nearing the parting of the ways. The outlook was particularly dark to the people of the border states, upon whom much of the hardship would fall in case things came to the worst and war between the sections actually took place.[3] Kentucky had been settled by pioneers from the old south and had sent its children as pioneers into southern Indiana, southern Illinois, Missouri,

[1] This paper was read at the fifteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at Iowa City on May 11, 1922.

[2] "Kentucky's first impression, very nearly universal among her citizens, was that the idea of disunion was a wild, unpatriotic, and insane idea." *Louisville Daily Journal*, April 26, 1861.

[3] "The border States are to be the people to be ground between the upper and nether mill stone. We whose interest is allied to both sections, who are dependent for an inlet to our commerce on the waters of the upper Mississippi, and for an outlet to the mouth of the same, are rashly and inconsiderately plunged into a war in which, no matter which party wins, we lose." *Daily Louisville Democrat*, April 17, 1861.

and elsewhere. Not only, therefore, was Kentucky related by blood to the people of the south, but it was also related to a people occupying land which had been dedicated to freedom.[4] Moreover, Kentucky was intimately bound to both sections by commercial ties and could see nothing but economic disaster in a dissolution of the union. It was under such circumstances as these that Kentuckians attempted to get their bearings in 1861 and the outcome was an attempt at neutrality between the sections which was similar in some respects to the attempt of the United States to maintain neutrality in the period from 1914 to 1917.

There was some talk of disunion in the south at the time of the split in the democratic party at Charleston in 1860[5] and Kentucky at that time discouraged such sentiments,[6] thus giving some indication of the position it would occupy when the threat became a reality. In the election of 1860 Bell had a plurality in Kentucky of 13,180 over Breckinridge and 40,372 over Douglas, while only 1,366 votes out of a total of 145,862 went to Lincoln.[7] During the campaign it was stated that a vote for Breckinridge would be a vote for disunion,[8] but this was emphatically denied at the time and a comparison of the vote in November, 1860, with that at the congressional election of June, 1861, shows that some Breckinridge counties were in fact union counties.[9]

[4] *Louisville Daily Journal,* January 14, 1861. "According to the census of 1850, the whole number of native Kentuckians in the ten seceding States was 27,772, while in the other States the number was not less than 219,871 — nearly six times as many. Then must Kentuckians join the Confederate States in this war, as the disunion organs say they must, just to fight for their friends and brethren against aliens?" *Ibid.,* June 26, 1861.

[5] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* May 6, 1860.

[6] "Thoughtless and restless persons talk of a dissolution of the Union. Such a proposition is absurd. This nation cannot be dissolved without the most desperate and unspairing war. Will Kentucky be willing to have a Canada border stretched along her boundaries? . . . Are the Northwestern States willing to give the outlet at the mouth of the Mississippi to the Southern States?" *Ibid.,* June 19, 1860.

[7] Lewis H. Collins, *History of Kentucky* (Covington, 1874), 1: 84.

[8] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* April 12, 1861.

[9] Carl R. Fish, "The decision of the Ohio valley," in American historical association, *Annual report,* 1910 (Washington, 1912), 163. When secession became an accomplished fact the union press in Kentucky was convinced that southern politicians had manipulated the campaign of 1860 in such a way as to insure the disruption of the union. "All the facts prove that Breckenridge was not nominated in

Governor Magoffin was a southern sympathizer, as he demonstrated in a letter to the editor of the *Frankfort Yeoman* in answer to the question, "What will Kentucky do, and what ought she to do, now that Lincoln is elected president?" On December 9 he sent a circular letter to the governors of the slave states in which he advocated an amendment to the constitution of the United States to invalidate all laws of any free state which nullified or obstructed the operation of the fugitive-slave law; to modify the fugitive-slave law in such manner as to guarantee to the owner of the slave compensation from the state failing to deliver the fugitive or obstructing his recovery; to provide for a division of all territory at the line thirty-seven degrees north latitude, all territory north of the line to come into the union as free states and all south of it, as slave states; to guarantee to all the states the free navigation of the Mississippi; and to give to the south power in the United States senate "to protect itself from unconstitutional or oppressive legislation upon slavery."[10] On December 27 S. F. Hale, a commissioner from Alabama, called upon Governor Magoffin and communicated with him in writing in regard to the coöperation of Kentucky in "righting the wrongs" of the south. Governor Magoffin readily concurred as to the existence of the wrongs, but he was not yet prepared to approve, openly at least, the plan of secession as a remedy.[11] He did, however, issue a proclamation calling an extra session of the legislature for January 17, 1861, to determine the course Kentucky should follow.[12]

The impulse to follow the cotton states into secession was very strong in Kentucky during the winter of 1860-1861 and it was only by very skillful political maneuvering that such action

good faith. He was nominated not to be elected, but to be beaten. He was nominated to divide the Democratic party, and to insure the election of Lincoln. He was nominated to produce a sectional contest, to inflame sectional animosities, and to prepare the way for a dissolution of the Union. The game was adroitly and successfully played." *Louisville Daily Journal,* April 1, 1861.

[10] Collins, *History of Kentucky,* 1:85.

[11] "You ask the co-operation of the Southern States in order to redress our wrongs; so do we. You have no hope of a redress in the Union. We look hopefully to assurances that a powerful reaction is going on at the North. You seek a remedy in secession from the Union. We wish the united action of the slave States assembled in a convention within the Union. You would act separately; we unitedly." *Daily Louisville Democrat,* January 4, 1861.

[12] Collins, *History of Kentucky,* 1:85.

was delayed until Lincoln became president on March 4, 1861. Most Kentuckians seemed to believe that the differences between the sections could be compromised and this policy was the first card played by the opponents of secession. The country had faced crises before[13] and on more than one occasion a great Kentuckian had brought about a compromise which, for a time at least, had quieted the troubled waters. At that very time another great Kentuckian, John J. Crittenden, "the idol of his party, the honored Lieutenant of CLAY while he lived and his successor after his death,"[14] was vainly attempting to bring about a compromise which would divide the territories between the free and the slave states, which would guarantee that slavery should not be abolished in the District of Columbia so long as it existed in Maryland and Virginia, and which would guarantee to the south the three-fifths ratio and the execution of the fugitive-slave law. Not only from Kentucky but from northern states as well petitions were sent to congress praying for the passage of the Crittenden resolutions.[15] It was quite generally believed in Kentucky that the crisis had been brought about by radical politicians on both sides[16] and that, if the substance of the Crittenden resolutions could be brought before the people of the United States in a popular referendum, the compromise would be approved and the union preserved.[17]

As it became more and more apparent that the Crittenden resolutions would not be passed by congress there was a rising sentiment in Kentucky for a convention to take the state out of the union. John C. Breckinridge, vice president of the United States, wrote to Governor Magoffin indorsing the call for an extra session of the legislature and favoring a state convention.[18] New chapters of the Knights of the Golden Circle were

[13] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* January 1, 1861.

[14] *Louisville Morning Courier,* January 8, 1861.

[15] Ann M. Coleman, *Life of John J. Crittenden* (Philadelphia, 1872), 2:304.

[16] "It is a matter of surprise to many of our readers that those who are most rampant for Secession are generally those who are enjoying the emoluments of the Federal offices in our midst." *Daily Louisville Democrat,* January 31, 1861.

[17] *Ibid.,* January 1, 15, 26, 1861. The *Louisville Morning Courier,* on the other hand, demanded practically everything contained in the Breckinridge platform of 1860. See the issue of January 11, 1861.

[18] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* January 15, 1861; *Louisville Morning Courier,* January 28, 1861.

instituted in Kentucky and great activity prevailed among the members of that organization;[19] "Southern Rights" meetings, at which resolutions were adopted in favor of immediate action, were held in several parts of the state; and certain newspapers were outspoken in favor of taking a decided position with the south.[20]

To counteract this movement for immediate secession union meetings were held in several counties[21] and delegates were chosen to two conventions to meet in Louisville on January 8, 1861, one made up chiefly of constitutional unionists and the other, of Douglas democrats, although some Breckinridge men joined in the movement.[22] The conventions met separately but they had a joint committee on resolutions. In these resolutions it was distinctly stated that Kentucky favored remaining in the union in spite of the fact that the slave states had just grounds to complain "of the bad fellowship and wrongs done us both in character and property, by some of the citizens of the free States." The election of Lincoln, it was held, was no just ground for secession, and it was pointed out that, since the democrats would control the next congress, there was no immediate danger to southern institutions. Finally, the Crittenden resolutions were approved and the hope was expressed that compromise might yet be arranged between the sections.[23]

The newspapers which were favorable to the union urged the people of Kentucky to "keep cool" and not to allow themselves to be rushed into disunion,[24] and able arguments were presented

[19] *Ibid.*, January 7, 1861; *Louisville Daily Journal*, January 5, 1861.

[20] *Louisville Morning Courier*, January 13, 22, 23, 24, 1861, with clippings from the *Henderson Reporter*, the *Woodford Pennant*, the *Paducah Herald*, and the *Maysville Express*. The *Woodford Pennant* stated: "The rubicon is crossed, and Kentucky may as well prepare immediately to go with the Southern States — the sooner she does so the better it will be for her."

[21] *Daily Louisville Democrat*, January 2, 3, 6, 1861.

[22] "It is only due to say that several Breckenridge men took part in the Democratic meeting and hereafter will be found keeping step to the music of the Union. They did not vote for Breckenridge as a Secessionist, but as a gentleman." *Ibid.*, January 19, 1861.

[23] *Ibid.* The *Louisville Morning Courier*, January 3, 1861, denounced "the partisan feeling that prompted the calls for these conventions," and regarded disunion as an accomplished fact. It was charged that the object of the conventions was to unite the Bell and Douglas parties in Kentucky. *Ibid.*, January 8, 1861.

[24] "This is a better Union than can be made out of its parts, and it will not

to show the uselessness of secession. Much was said in the cotton states, it was pointed out, about the failure to execute the fugitive-slave law, but the border states were the chief losers and secession not only would give no redress for the grievance but would actually aggravate the evil by virtually bringing the Canadian border to the Ohio river.[25] Moreover, it was claimed that this grievance was generally exaggerated in the south in that the details of every case of rescue were published while nothing was said of those cases in which the law was executed.[26] On the other hand, it was argued by the secessionists that the southern confederacy, "having control of the mouth of the Mississippi river, could dictate such a fugitive slave law as the Northwest would never refuse to execute and which would render the return of fugitives from labor more effective and certain than any amendment to the present Constitution could possibly accomplish."[27]

Aside from sentimental reasons for the preservation of the union and a belief in the possibility of compromise, it was maintained by the unionists that economic factors would demand that Kentucky remain in the union. The secessionists argued that the business depression then existing was caused by the failure of Kentucky to take its position with the south, whose planters were the best customers of Kentucky merchants.[28] These merchants had been buying from the east and selling to the south and some of them believed that those customers would be lost to them for all time if Kentucky did not go with the cotton states. The unionists argued that the only safeguard for that trade lay in the preservation of the union. If Kentucky were in the southern confederacy it could not bring in its merchandise through a southern port, convey the goods to Kentucky, and then reship them to the lower south. On the other hand, Kentucky could not bring in its goods through a southern port and sell to the north, thus reversing the former stream of trade, because it would find a tariff wall erected against it in case it

require half the wisdom and forbearance to preserve it that it will to make a tolerable government without it." *Daily Louisville Democrat,* January 2, 1861.

[25] *Ibid.,* January 2, 1861.

[26] *Ibid.,* February 5, 1861.

[27] *Louisville Morning Courier,* February 23, 1861.

[28] *Ibid.,* March 8, 1861.

joined the confederacy. The consequence would be that Kentucky would be solely dependent on the production of agricultural products. Thus it was argued that from an economic standpoint the true interests of Kentucky were with the union.[29]

In order to divert the attention of the people from immediate secession, much was said in Kentucky about the formation of a middle or central confederacy in case the union should actually be broken up. This idea was mentioned in the resolutions of several union meetings in different counties and was favorably commented on by the union newspapers. It was even pointed out by one such newspaper that Louisville would be a logical place for the capital of the new nation.[30] The idea was to eliminate both New England and the cotton states, which Kentuckians regarded as the two disturbing elements in the union, and to include in the central confederacy most of the other states.[31] The ease with which inconsistencies could be pointed out in the position of the unionists who were talking about a central confederacy[32] indicates that it probably was, as its opponents charged, merely a device to delay action in Kentucky in regard to immediate secession.[33]

In his message to the legislature, which met in extra session on January 17, 1861, Governor Magoffin assumed that the union was already virtually dissolved. "We, the people of the United States," he said, "are no longer one people, united and friendly. The ties of fraternal love and concord, which once bound us together, are sundered. Though the Union of the States may, by the abstract reasoning of a class, be construed still to exist, it is really and practically, to an extent at least, fatally impaired. . . . Kentucky will not and ought not to submit

[29] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* March 16, 1861.

[30] *Ibid.,* January 11, 1861.

[31] *Ibid.,* January 8, 11, 18, 1861.

[32] "If it is so horrible to divide into *two Confederacies,* how does it help matters to divide into *three or four*?" *Louisville Morning Courier,* January 15, 1861.

[33] "The Opposition, or rather the 'Subfissionists (in the legislature) are well organized, and will make a sharp effort to indorse something looking to a Central Confederacy, and then adjourn. If they cannot succeed in this, they will fight every proposition to place the State in the position where her interests, her honor, and her safety demand that she shall occupy. Their object is to delay any definite action, if they cannot prevent it, until it will be too late to act at all." *Ibid.,* January 18, 1861.

to the principles and policy avowed by the Republican party, but will resist to the death, if necessary. . . . The people of Kentucky will never stand by with arms folded while those [Southern] States, struggling for their constitutional rights and resisting oppression, are being subjugated to an anti-slavery government."[34] He closed by recommending a state convention to consider "the future Federal and inter-State relations of Kentucky." He also advised that efforts be made to hold a convention of delegates from the different states to consider measures to avert war between the sections — in other words, to arrange for peaceable secession.

Precipitate action was at that time the plan of the disunionists[35] and, consequently, the immediate problem for the friends of the union was to prevent or delay the calling of a convention. The situation was highly critical when the legislature met. Some members favored extreme measures and many others entertained honest doubts as to the proper course to pursue.[36] Each day skirmishing took place between the union and the disunion forces in the legislature and victory seemed to belong first to one and then to the other. So evenly did they stand during the first week of the session that even the most accurate calculators were unable to determine which was numerically the stronger.[37] The two groups in the legislature were thoroughly organized, caucuses were held, and all the tricks known to the practical politician were used to get and to keep the followers in line.[38] The constitutional unionists and the Douglas democrats, by acting together in favor of the preservation of the union, could claim almost a tie in the senate with the Breckinridge men, but they were in the minority in the house. Had all Breckinridge men been rampant secessionists, Kentucky would have had a state convention and in all probability would have passed an ordinance of secession before March 4, 1861. The

[34] The message in full was published in the *Daily Louisville Democrat,* January 18, 1861.

[35] "If Kentucky has any future before her, she will act now, firmly and heroically. . . . Too much time has already been wasted. The historic moment once past, never returns. For us and for Kentucky the time to act is NOW OR NEVER." *Louisville Morning Courier,* January 25, 1861.

[36] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* January 18, 1861.

[37] *Ibid.,* January 24, 1861.

[38] *Louisville Morning Courier,* January 23, 1861.

most incendiary appeals were made for immediate and decisive action, pleas for calmness were scorned by the seceders, and threats were boldly made that unless Kentucky went with the south certain parts of the state would rebel against the state itself. On the whole, the disunion element overreached itself in the determination to force immediate action and Breckinridge men refused to act as a unit. On the contrary, some of them came out against immediate secession and this gave the victory to the friends of the union. On a test vote in the house the convention bill was killed by a vote of 54 to 36, and it was then known that it stood no chance of passing in the senate where the forces were more evenly divided.[39] After declaring that at that time further action on political affairs was both unnecessary and inexpedient, the legislature, on February 11, adjourned until March 20, 1861.[40]

The immediate crisis was successfully passed by the unionists, and those who advocated decisive action realized that they had lost what was probably their best chance for success in Kentucky, although they were by no means ready to give up the fight. "The Black Republican Party and their allies in the South — the Right and Left wings of the great Liberal party — " said the *Louisville Morning Courier* of February 23, 1861, "have secured one important point — they have prevented the Border Slave States from taking any decisive action for the protection of their sovereign rights and the maintainance of their sovereign equality and independence until it is too late to do anything before Mr. Lincoln and his friends have obtained possession of the Government."

During the recess of the legislature both sides were getting ready for the contest that all men knew would come when that body met again on March 20, and both sides shifted positions somewhat from those occupied during the January session. Early in March petitions were circulated, chiefly in the rural

[39] *Daily Louisville Democrat*, February 15, 1861.

[40] Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1: 66. "Hurrah for our last legislature! They have acted nobly in the present crisis. They have refused to precipitate at the instigation of politicians whose only salvation was in secession. The State will stand firm. She inscribed in the Washington Monument 'Kentucky will be the last to leave the Union'. She will do more. She will, with Tennessee and Virginia, be the first to save the Union." *Daily Louisville Democrat*, February 14, 1861.

districts, asking Governor Magoffin to call a convention to consider secession, without waiting for action by the legislature. The idea seemed to be that the legislature, which had been elected in 1859, did not represent the attitude of the people on the question of secession and that petitions could be circulated until a majority of the voters had signed. This "expression of the will of the sovereign people of the Commonwealth" was to be sufficient authority for Governor Magoffin to issue writs of election for delegates to a convention. This extralegal, or illegal, movement was denounced by the union newspapers and the plan was soon given up.[41] In lieu of this plan, a southern rights association, with clubs or chapters in the different parts of the state, was formed "for the purpose of maintaining Southern rights and placing Kentucky in her proper position with the South," and a convention composed of representatives from these clubs was called to meet in Frankfort on March 20, the opening day of the adjourned session of the legislature.[42] This plan "to drive or dupe the legislature into revolution by manufactured public sentiment" was opposed by the union forces[43] and, to offset it, a call was sent out for a union mass convention to meet in Frankfort at the same time.[44] Efforts were also made to organize more thoroughly the union forces throughout the state[45] and petitions were signed protesting against the calling of a convention "for the purpose of precipitating Kentucky into secession."[46] In both of these movements strenuous efforts were made to break down previous party alignment.[47]

When the legislature met again on March 20, a majority of

[41] *Louisville Daily Journal,* March 6, 1861.

[42] *Louisville Morning Courier,* March 11, 13, 14, 18, 20, 22, 1861.

[43] *Louisville Daily Journal,* March 9, 11, 19, 23, 1861; *Daily Louisville Democrat,* March 14, 1861.

[44] "Let the more prominent and influential friends of the Union in the several counties of the State deem it their solemn duty to confront the agents of secession at Frankfort, *and discharge the duty at whatever cost of time and trouble.*" *Louisville Daily Journal,* March 11, 1861.

[45] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* March 29, 1861.

[46] *Ibid.,* March 27, 1861.

[47] *Louisville Daily Journal,* March 22, 1861. "We would like to see this hybrid secession party in Kentucky take some shape. When will these waggletails become mosquitoes and these tadpoles frogs? Is it fish, flesh, or fowl, or a combination of the first two making the last and spelling it with a U?" *Daily Louisville Democrat,* April 7, 1861.

the members still opposed the calling of a convention and the most important thing accomplished was the passage of an act on April 3, 1861,[48] providing for the election of delegates to a border slave state convention, a plan originally suggested by Virginia. The election of delegates to represent Kentucky in that convention was to be held on May 4 and the convention was to meet in Frankfort on May 27. The idea of a state convention was, for the time being, apparently dropped by the disunionists and both sides seemed to favor the border slave state convention, but from opposite motives. The disunionists wanted to present the Crittenden resolutions as an ultimatum and in case they were not accepted by both the north and the south, as it was then perfectly evident that they would not be, the rejection of them was to be used to precipitate Kentucky into secession.[49]

Both sides nominated full general tickets, two candidates from the state at large and one from each of the ten congressional districts. It now looked as if there would be an opportunity for the people to express in a legal manner a definite preference for or against the union, but before the day set for the election came Fort Sumter had been fired on and the disunion ticket was withdrawn in most of the counties.[50] The election was held, however, and the union ticket was elected by a vote of 106,863 to 4,262.[51]

Eleven delegates from Kentucky, four from Missouri, and one from Tennessee met in Frankfort on May 27 and John J. Crittenden was chosen as the presiding officer of the convention. About all that was attempted under the circumstances was the preparation of an address to the people of the United States recommending the principles embraced in the Crittenden reso-

[48] *Ibid.*, April 4, 1861.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] "The Secession ticket would have been badly beaten and its friends wisely withdrew it." *Daily Louisville Democrat*, April 30, 1861. Following the attack on Fort Sumter, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas seceded, and the disunionists in Kentucky gave this as the reason for dropping the idea of a border slave state convention.

[51] *Ibid.*, June 19, 1861, in which are given the official figures for the state. As the total vote cast in the state in 1860 was 145,216, this would indicate that a majority of the people of Kentucky favored the union, although the *Louisville Morning Courier*, May 6, 1861, claimed that many votes were fraudulently cast.

lutions "as a means of quieting the apprehensions existing in the slaveholding States" and entreating the south "to re-examine the question of the necessity of secession."[52] The Kentucky delegation drew up an address to the people of the state in which they approved the plan of neutrality and held out the hope that with such a policy Kentucky might be able to mediate between the sections.[53]

The difficulties of maintaining neutrality were increased and Kentucky was ushered into a second stage, that of armed neutrality, by the firing on Fort Sumter, an event which produced a real crisis in Kentucky. A wave of enthusiasm for the confederacy swept over the state, companies of soldiers left for the confederacy, and the secessionists renewed their efforts to take Kentucky out of the union while the excitement was at white heat.[54] The newspapers which favored the union still urged neutrality and implored the people not to fall victims to the plans of the south.[55]

President Lincoln's call for volunteers brought forth a curt refusal from Governor Magoffin[56] and aroused, even among union men,[57] a powerful determination to oppose coercion, although it was stated by the unionists that the south was the aggressor and that the aggression was for the purpose of co-

[52] *Daily Louisville Democrat,* June 6, 1861.

[53] *Ibid.*

[54] *Ibid.,* April 14, 1861; *Louisville Morning Courier,* April 17, 1861.

[55] "These Confederate States fired at Fort Sumter ostensibly but the shots were aimed at Virginia, Kentucky, and other Border States. It was to bring them to, that the attack on Sumter was made. Sumter was of little consequence to the Confederate States — not worth the powder spent on it; but the Border States were worth shooting at." *Daily Louisville Democrat,* April 28, 1861.

[56] "Your dispatch is received. In reply, I say emphatically, Kentucky will furnish no troops for the wicked purpose of subdueing her sister Southern States. B. Magoffin, Governor of Kentucky." *Ibid.,* April 17, 1861.

[57] "There is but one expression on the streets regarding the President's proclamation and that is sorrowful indignation. Union men are very severe upon the Administration's coercive policy, and while they are still devoted to the Union and desire its reconstruction and preservation, they are opposed in any way to the inauguration of civil war, and will resist all attempts to carry out the programme shadowed forth in the proclamation." *Ibid.,* April 16, 1861. The same sentiment was expressed in the *Louisville Daily Journal,* April 17, 1861. "Any attempt at coercion can only end in the calamities of war, and produce nothing but evil. This sentiment is universal in this State, and not a man can be had for this fight. It will be fatal to the cause of the Union." *Daily Louisville Democrat,* April 17, 1861.

ercing the border states.[58] The secessionists of Kentucky, in a meeting held at Louisville on April 16, condemned President Lincoln's war policy, justified South Carolina in the attack on Fort Sumter, and declared that it was the immediate and imperative duty of Kentucky to arm itself.[59] It was stated that one reason for arming the state was to prevent troops from crossing Kentucky for the purpose of coercing the south. Even the unionists were afraid of the policy of coercion for fear that it might be Kentucky's turn next if it was once conceded that the national government could coerce a state.[60] The idea of the union generally prevalent in Kentucky was that it had hitherto been a voluntary association and that the use of force to prevent secession would not preserve the old union but would in fact create a new union based on force instead of on voluntary action.[61] According to this view, both the national government and the confederate states had departed from the original idea, leaving Kentucky practically alone so far as its idea of the union was concerned. Some people in Kentucky thought that, both sides to the controversy having occupied new ground, Kentucky was left in the position of an independent state.[62] With such conflicting ideas as to what Kentucky should do, the conclusion reached was that it should still maintain neutrality, but now an armed neutrality, and that it should oppose both secession and coercion.[63] Although the secessionists had at first argued that

[58] "The fight was made upon a demand impossible to be granted. The object was not to benefit the Southern Confederacy as it is, but to coerce the Border States." *Ibid.*, April 16, 1861.

[59] *Ibid.*, April 17, 1861; *Louisville Morning Courier*, April 17, 1861.

[60] *Daily Louisville Democrat*, April 16, 1861.

[61] "No man can protest too earnestly or vehemently against what is called coercion. Even if the United States could subjugate the seceding States utterly and establish the national jurisdiction therein by the presence of a standing army, no purpose would be accomplished that any patriotic or good citizen could desire. The old Union might exist in name, but only in name. There would be nothing of the vitality of freedom in the conquered portion of it." *Louisville Daily Journal*, April 18, 1861.

[62] H. W. Bruce, later the southern rights candidate for congress in the June election, speaking at the secession meeting at Louisville on April 16, said: "A surrender of States rights to the Union is a surrender of all rights to a central government and must descend into a military despotism. Kentucky is as much an independent Republic as the whole Union. In the dissolution of the Union she was reinvested with sovereign powers." *Daily Louisville Democrat*, April 17, 1861.

[63] "Let us stand alone, resolute against *Coercion* and *Secession*. . . . We

the position of neutrality was rendered impossible by the firing on Fort Sumter and by Lincoln's call for volunteers,[64] they soon came out in favor of armed neutrality, although some of them had little faith in it [65] or tried it only as a means of getting Kentucky out of the union. [66]

Governor Magoffin made application to the banks of Kentucky for a loan of half a million dollars for the purpose of arming the state. The southern bank of Kentucky placed sixty thousand dollars to the official credit of the governor, the Bank of Louisville and the Commercial bank each furnished ten thousand dollars, and the president of the Peoples' bank stated that his institution was ready to supply its quota,[67] but the other banks stipulated as a condition for the loan that the money should not be used for aggressive purposes but that it should be used only to preserve neutrality. [68] There was grave suspicion regarding Governor Magoffin's plan for borrowing the money from the banks instead of bringing the legislature together again to make an appropriation [69] and it was thought by some people that he intended to arm the state for the purpose of opposing the union and aiding the confederacy. [70] Failing in the plan to borrow the

shall not entertain the idea that this Union cannot be restored. We may see darker hours than these; but the object is worth the struggle, and it is all left worth fighting for.'' *Daily Louisville Democrat,* April 16, 1861.

64 ''Kentucky cannot be neutral. Kentucky will go with the South. It is foolish to 'kick against the pricks.' '' *Louisville Morning Courier,* April 20, 1861.

65 ''Mr. Breckenridge thinks lightly of armed neutrality.'' *Daily Louisville Democrat,* April 23, 1861.

66 ''It is remarkable that the Secessionists are not now for secession. Indirect ways will do better.'' *Ibid.,* May 19, 1861.

67 For Governor Magoffin's message to the legislature, published in full, see *ibid.,* May 8, 1861.

68 *Ibid.,* April 19, 1861.

69 ''We understand that there are disunionists among them [the bankers] and we do not gainsay their rights to their opinions, but we hope they will not manifest their disunion principles in their official action.'' *Louisville Daily Journal,* April 27, 1861. ''The Governor is mortified that he failed to get a half million from the banks on his own terms for arming the State. We are glad he failed, but sorry he is mortified. The banks were willing to make the loan on condition that it should be used in arming Kentucky to defend herself in her present status; and if he had wanted it for such a purpose *he would have taken it.*'' *Ibid.,* April 27, 1861.

70 ''The St. Louis Republican most heartily indorses the position of Kentucky and the response of the banks to Governor Magoffin's call for money. It urges them to maintain it because our Governor, it states, is known to be a half disunionist. We know the other half in this latitude and can assure the Republican that the banks will act for the best.'' *Daily Louisville Democrat,* April 24, 1861.

money on his own terms, there was no recourse but to apply to the legislature for an appropriation.

The legislature met on May 7 for the third time that year. In his message, Governor Magoffin reviewed the events of the preceding weeks and stated that "it is idle longer to refuse to recognize the fact that the late American Union is dissolved." He again recommended the calling of a convention and advised the arming of the state guard, an organization which later proved to be composed largely of southern sympathizers, but again the legislature refused to follow his recommendations.

Two special elections were held in Kentucky during the summer of 1861 and the results of those elections show the trend of public opinion at that time. The special election for members of congress was held on June 20; both union and southern rights tickets were in the field and the result was a union victory. The first district elected a southern rights man, but the other nine districts chose union men, the total union majority in the state being 54,760.[71] In spite of this defeat the southern rights men put forth renewed efforts to carry the August election for members of the legislature,[72] but this election was also a union victory.[73] These elections demonstrated that a majority of the people of Kentucky were opposed to secession, but they could not be interpreted as an approval of the war policy of the Lincoln administration, as was quite generally done at the north at that time.[74] Perhaps the best explanation of the state of public opinion at that time was that the people of Kentucky desired peace and thought that the election of the union candidates was the best way to get it.[75]

The third and last stage of Kentucky neutrality extended from the early part of August to the latter part of September, 1861, and on the surface both sides were observing the situation

[71] Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1:92.

[72] *Louisville Morning Courier*, July 10, 22, August 5, 1861.

[73] In the new house of representatives there were seventy-six union men and twenty-four southern rights men, while in the senate the numbers, counting the holdovers, were respectively twenty-seven and eleven. Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1:92; *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 27, 1861. There was a strong German element in Louisville and, in spite of efforts to intimidate them, they voted "almost en masse" for the union ticket. *Louisville Morning Courier*, August 12, 1861; *Daily Louisville Democrat*, June 20, 1861.

[74] *Louisville Morning Courier*, August 7, 1861.

[75] *Ibid.*, June 28, 1861.

of armed neutrality.[76] The problem for the union leaders was to bring public opinion safely from the position of armed neutrality to a definite and unqualified stand with the Washington government against the southern confederacy. That this was accomplished was due largely to the attitude of the Lincoln administration in not pressing for an immediate decision. Perhaps nowhere did President Lincoln display greater tact than in his handling of the situation in Kentucky.[77] It required endless patience and great skill to bring Kentucky out of its position of neutrality because public opinion was so slow in crystallizing in favor of actual participation in the war on the side of the union. A false move on the part of President Lincoln or of the union leaders in the state would have meant that Kentucky would have gone with the south and, in that event, there would probably have been a dissolution of the union. Frémont's proclamation freeing the slaves in Missouri almost upset the union plans in Kentucky, but President Lincoln's disavowal of the proclamation saved the day and enabled the union leaders to carry out their plans.[78]

Both sides again shifted positions after the August election. The southern rights men now directed their attention to the organization of a peace movement without saying anything about the conditions of peace. A mass convention was called to meet in Louisville on August 17, at which time a large white flag was

[76] "The disunionists profess to have come over to the position of neutrality, but the profession is a hollow one." *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 14, 1861.

[77] On April 26, President Lincoln assured Garrett Davis that, while it was Kentucky's duty to have furnished the troops for which requisition had been made, if Kentucky would not make war upon the United States the government would not make war upon Kentucky. Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1:88.

[78] In his letter to Frémont, dated September 2, 1861, President Lincoln stated that the proclamation, unless changed, would "perhaps ruin our rather fair prospects for Kentucky." In a letter to O. H. Browning, dated September 22, 1861, he wrote: "The Kentucky legislature would not budge till that proclamation was modified; and General Anderson telegraphed me that on the news of General Fremont having actually issued deeds of manumission, a whole company of our volunteers threw down their arms and disbanded. I was so assured as to think it probable that the very arms we had furnished Kentucky would be turned against us. I think to lose Kentucky is nearly the same as to lose the whole game. Kentucky gone, we cannot hold Missouri, nor, as I think, Maryland. These all against us, and the job on our hands is too big for us. We would as well consent to separation at once, including the surrender of this capital." *Complete works of Abraham Lincoln*, edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay (New York, [1905]), 6: 351, 359-360.

to be raised and southern rights men were asked to raise white flags over their residences and places of business.[79] The unionists declared that this plan was only to disguise a movement for the use of force to take Kentucky out of the union, and very little headway seems to have been made with it.

Under the policy of armed neutrality Governor Magoffin, as fully as he was able to accomplish it, built up the efficiency of the state guard at the apparent neglect of the home guard, which was more loyal to the union. The outcome of this policy was that the state guard was disbanded by the legislature.[80] The union sentiment was stimulated through the use of the patronage[81] and by the establishment of Camp Dick Robinson, where union recruits from Kentucky were assembled and drilled with arms furnished by the Lincoln administration.[82] The leaders on both sides were now convinced that the position of neutrality could not be maintained much longer, but each wanted the other to be the first to depart from the policy. The disunionists complained of the union camp in Kentucky and declared that it was a violation of neutrality,[83] while the union leaders declared that the state guard was being used to try to provoke a fight. The fact probably was that the state guard would have been used to take Kentucky out of the union except for the presence of the union troops at Camp Dick Robinson.[84]

[79] *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 15, 1861.

[80] *Ibid.*, August 21, 30, September 12, 1861; *Louisville Morning Courier*, August 21, 1861; Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1:94. Many men in the state guard took their equipment and joined the confederate army, and S. B. Buckner gave up the command of the state guard and entered the confederate service. *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 30, 1861.

[81] "We have reason to believe that the patronage of the Federal Government in this State is in the hands of some person or persons who is, or are, using it to stifle the Southern Rights feeling and to strengthen the cause of submission to the usurpations of the administration." *Louisville Morning Courier*, May 16, 1861; *Daily Louisville Democrat*, May 17, 1861.

[82] Major Robert Anderson, commander at Fort Sumter, and Lieutenant William Nelson, of the United States navy, both native Kentuckians, were sent to Kentucky to cultivate the union sentiment in the state. Nelson was in command at Camp Dick Robinson. *Ibid.*, June 5, 1861; *Louisville Morning Courier*, June 27, August 19, 24, 1861; Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1:91, 92, 94; Lincoln, *Works* (Nicolay and Hay, eds.), 6: 294-295, 325-326, 349-350.

[83] *Louisville Morning Courier*, August 24, September 5, 6, 9, 1861; Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1:92.

[84] Garret Davis to Salmon P. Chase, August 21, 1861, in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1902 (Washington, 1903), 2: 498-499.

Realizing that the game was lost in Kentucky unless force was used, some disunionists wanted to strike at least one blow before giving in to the inevitable. [85]

When the newly elected legislature met the situation soon cleared up for the abandonment of neutrality. On September 3 confederate troops from Tennessee moved into Kentucky and fortified positions at Hickman and Columbus, and two days later union troops crossed the Ohio and occupied Paducah and other points in Kentucky. On September 7 the United States flag was hoisted over the capitol at Frankfort and on September 11 the legislature, by an overwhelming vote, instructed Governor Magoffin to inform the confederates that their troops must be unconditionally withdrawn from Kentucky. This resolution was vetoed by Governor Magoffin and was promptly passed over his veto. A week later the legislature resolved to call upon the United States for assistance in expelling the confederates, General Robert Anderson was requested to take instant command of the union forces in Kentucky, and Governor Magoffin was instructed to call out the militia and to place it under the command of General Thomas L. Crittenden. These resolutions were vetoed by Governor Magoffin and were immediately passed over the veto. [86] Finally, on September 27, the legislature issued an address which showed that neutrality in Kentucky was at an end. [87]

As the months of 1861 passed by there gradually evolved in the minds of Kentuckians the realization that under the circumstances, which Kentucky had sincerely if vainly attempted to modify, not only was war inevitable but perhaps it was best

[85] "Shall we share the fate of Missouri and Maryland without striking at least one blow, however feeble, for LIBERTY AND INDEPENDENCE?" *Louisville Morning Courier*, August 22, 1861.

[86] Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 1:93.

[87] "We believe we have done our duty. . . . The only error, we fear, is that we have not been as prompt, you may think, as the occasion demanded. Thrice have the revolutionists appealed to the ballot-box, in this State, and thrice have the people expressed, by overwhelming majorities, their determination to stand by the Union and its Government. . . . Our hope of an amicable adjustment, and a desire for peace, led us to forbear, until forbearance has ceased to be a virtue. The attempt to destroy the Union of these States we believe to be a crime, not only against Kentucky, but against all mankind." *Louisville Daily Journal*, September 28, 1861.

that the issue of secession be settled once for all. In an editorial entitled "Evils are often blessings in disguise," the editor of the *Louisville Daily Journal* as early as June 21, 1861, wrote: "In view of all this let us not, in confronting the realities of our present position, regret that the alleged discovery of the doctrine of secession — the power of self-destruction in a constitution — has been advanced in our time. Today it looks comparatively manageable. Normally, today, we have a population one in language, and differing but little in political sentiment, distributed from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Let the question be settled now, whilst we are not too mighty for the experiment, which, a half century hence, might crush constitutional liberty by its mere weight, and be the destruction of public liberty on this continent to the end of time."

Wilson Porter Shortridge

West Virginia University
Morgantown

CELORON DE BLAINVILLE AND FRENCH EXPANSION IN THE OHIO VALLEY

The French colonies in America in the middle of the eighteenth century reflected the life and the thought of France—in large measure the thought of the France of and after Louis XIV. For the institutions of France were largely reshaped by Colbert and Louis XIV. The former, while giving France workable economic and political bases, also fostered the colonies. The latter wielded the resources thus provided for military ends. After their joint efforts France appeared gallant, polished, patriotic, frivolous, glory-loving, and tax-ridden. Meanwhile the ideals of Louis and of his great minister and also the administrative system which they built endured after them. But they fell into weaker and meaner hands.

Yet France, with all its defects and weaknesses, possessed the capacity and the energy for a large national rôle, nourished with care projects for colonial expansion, and pursued in its colonies a policy of paternalism which largely explained both the fact and the limited extent of its success in that field.

The situation in America after the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle demanded the best that France had to give. The English colonies were beginning a new phase of their expansion. Heretofore they had been content to wax strong between the Appalachians and the sea, facing through the passes of those mountains Canada on the north and Louisiana on the west. Now they were bursting over the barrier, choosing infallibly the point of least resistance along the Ohio valley. Here that great stream formed an inviting highway; here the Indians, slightly bound to the French, turned eagerly to English traders; and here also lay the vulnerable joint between Canada and Louisiana.

A prominent and significant figure in the contest for this great valley was Pierre-Joseph Céloron de Blainville. Like many another of the French leaders in the new world, he was a combination of soldier and fur-trader. He came from a family which

had held important stations in the French king's household in the seventeenth century. For three generations his ancestors had served as councilors of the king. The son of the last of these emigrated to Canada about 1684.[1] His son, Pierre-Joseph, was born at Montreal in 1693.[2] He entered the army as a youth and rose to the rank of lieutenant in 1731 and to that of captain in 1738.[3] He reached middle life before opportunities for distinction came to him. He served as commandant at Mackinac from 1734 to 1739,[4] and then was sent as a captain in the expedition which went from Canada in the latter year under the command of the Baron de Longueuil to aid the governor of Louisiana against the Chickasaw and Natchez tribes. In the course of this campaign he displayed leadership of the highest quality as the commander against the Chickasaw under the orders of the governor of Louisiana, after the latter had abandoned the enterprise without a blow.[5] The Indians were intimidated into seeking peace. As a reward for these services Céloron was made a chevalier of the Order of St. Louis and, after a resumption of his service at Mackinac, commandant at Detroit with the rank of major. He served there during 1742 and 1743.[6]

He appears in the next year as commander of the fort at Niagara.[7] Here his pugnacity was such that he not only denounced the official trader at Niagara to his superiors as incompetent but he also clashed with the governor-general and the intendant of Canada and with the commissioner of the marine.

[1] For the facts relating to the family of Pierre-Joseph Céloron de Blainville, see Pierre-Georges Roy, *La famille Céloron de Blainville* (Lévis, 1909), 5-17. For calling his attention to this work and for data from the Alphabet Lafillard, the author is indebted to Mr. James F. Kenney of the Canadian archives.

[2] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 17:207, note.

[3] Alphabet Lafillard, Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies D2 222.

[4] *Michigan pioneer and historical collections*, 34:327, 328.

[5] Report of Boisherbert, in *Documents relative to the colonial history of the state of New-York*, edited by Edmund B. O'Callaghan (Albany, 1853-1887), 10:84. See also abstracts of documents on this expedition in *Report concerning Canadian archives for the year 1905* (Ottawa, 1906), vol. 1, part 6, p. 461, and Roy, *La famille Céloron de Blainville*, 19-20.

[6] Note by the Reverend A. A. Lambing, in *Expedition of Céloron to the Ohio country in 1749*, edited by Charles B. Galbreath (Columbus, 1921), 74-75; Roy, *La famille Céloron de Blainville*, 20-21.

[7] Beauharnois to Maurepas, October 8, 1744, in *Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York* (O'Callaghan, ed.), 9:1104.

In this affair the home authorities not only felt that Céloron held himself unnecessarily aloof in his relations with the authorized trader at Niagara but condemned him, in company with other commanders of Canadian posts, for evading orders to assist the lessees of the trading privileges in their respective posts. A rebuke to the commandant from the home government based upon these grounds and upon his failure to consult his superiors regarding matters of either trade or defense was followed in 1745 by his removal from his office by the governor-general. Nevertheless, the report of his removal was accompanied by the comment that his superior could "only attribute such stubbornness to the inflexible character of this officer who has moreover all the essential qualities of a man of war." Since the culprit had "seriously reflected," the minister was asked to "forget this affair," and the following year Céloron was again commanding at Niagara.[8]

War was now being waged with England and, although Niagara, as it proved, lay outside their field of operations, the English had considered plans for attacking it.[9] It was therefore natural that a "man of war" should hold that post. In 1747 Céloron was transferred to the command of the French stronghold at Crown Point on Lake Champlain, a point of greater danger.[10] He assumed command there at the time when it faced the greatest peril which threatened it during that war. An ambitious plan for the conquest of Canada, one portion of which was to be executed by way of Crown Point and Lake Champlain, was apparently about to materialize. We are told that here he "acquired the esteem of everybody" and that he deserved promotion, "being one of the best officers we have, and even one of the oldest captains."[11]

[8] For this affair, see abstracts of letters from the president of the navy board to Hocquart, April 26, 1745, to Céloron, April 28, 1745, to Beauharnois, May 5, 1745, to La Jonquière, March 6, 1747, in *Report concerning Canadian archives for the year 1905,* vol. 1, part 6, pp. 42-43, 44, 45, 84; Frank H. Severance, *An old frontier of France; the Niagara region and adjacent lakes under French control* (New York, 1917), 1:386-391; Roy, *La famille Céloron de Blainville,* 21-22.

[9] Abstract of the king's instructions to Duquesne, May 15, 1752, in *Report concerning Canadian archives for the year 1905,* vol. 1, part 6, p. 165.

[10] Roy, *La famille Céloron de Blainville,* 22; Severance, *An old frontier of France,* 1:405.

[11] Report of Boisherbert, in Roy, *La famille Céloron de Blainville,* 22, and in

In 1748, when the menace to Crown Point was past and when disaffection was rampant among the western tribes, he was given the command of the strong convoy which accompanied the large flotilla of merchandise-laden canoes on their annual expedition to the upper posts. This wilderness armada greatly impressed the Iroquois and incited the awed chiefs of Detroit to appear humbly at Montreal.[12] After this service Céloron came with a distinguished record and the confidence of his superiors to the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.

This treaty established peace without amity. Fighting in America was suspended merely that each nation might concentrate its energies without restraint upon those colonial enterprises nearest its heart. England founded Halifax that its stock might take root in, dominate, and defend the Acadian peninsula, as a counterweight to Louisburg, which, through the exigencies of diplomacy, was again French. This colonization was good English seaboard policy with a thrust toward the lower St. Lawrence. France parried this thrust, hastened to occupy and fortify Louisburg, maintained its position between New England and the upper Hudson valley at Crown Point, and turned to meet the newest and the most dangerous threat of the English in the west.

While these proceedings portended the early breaking of the truce then existing between the two powers, both turned willingly to the appointment of commissaries to settle at Paris the boundaries between their American colonies, as well as certain other specified problems.[13] Neither expected to grant what the other desired and both wished to procure uninterrupted leisure

Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York (O'Callaghan, ed.), 10:84, 85; *Wisconsin historical collections*, 17:207, note.

[12] Rouillé to La Jonquière, May 4, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 89:223-226; *Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York* (O'Callaghan, ed.), 10:161, 178; La Galissonière to Maurepas, October 23, 1748, *ibid.*, 182.

[13] Puysieulx to Bigot, December 24, 1749, in Canadian archives, ministère des affaires étrangères, mémoires et documents, Amerique, 9-1:190-191; instructions to French commissaries, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, C11 (III):20-47; Bedford to Albermarle, February 12, March 1, 29, 1750, in British museum, additional manuscripts, 32820:200-201, 203, 281-282, 395; board of trade to Shirley and Mildmay, in Canadian archives, Nova Scotia A, 39:262-275; instructions to Shirley and Mildmay, August 10, 1750, in Public record office, state papers, foreign, France, 238:109-116.

in which to carry to completion cherished plans for aggrandizement.

The French problem in America was far from simple or easy of solution. It involved the economic foundation of Canada. That foundation was the fur trade and French success in it implied a substantial French monopoly of it with the tribes of the great interior of the continent. In the effort to establish such a monopoly the French sought to inclose these interior tribes in a receptacle impervious to English influences. In the early days of colonization the Appalachian mountain system had served fairly well to keep the English and the interior tribes apart. The English, however, gradually followed the river valleys to the gaps or passes of the mountains and attracted the Indians beyond with bargains so tempting that permanent and open competition with them must spell the ruin of the French trade.

Then the French resorted to the construction of forts and trading posts across the line of the English advance and at certain interior points for the convenience of the traders. These establishments were essentially alike, for the forts were usually trading posts and the trading posts were always, upon a modest scale, forts. They offered a welcome and traffic to the Indians and defiance to the English. The inferior strength of the French made it necessary that these strongholds at Quebec and westward should be located within the drainage basin of the St. Lawrence and the Great lakes and that of the Mississippi, while in New York the Iroquois, backed by the English, held the French to the margin of their great highway and barrier or behind it.

With the extension of French occupation and fur-trading into the country west of Lake Superior and the upper Mississippi valley in the decade and a half before King George's war, New France was assuming the general form of a capital letter T, supported by Louisiana along the Mississippi valley. Louisiana lay between the English and the Spanish settlements and eastern Canada lay between the English colonies and the English posts upon Hudson bay. Because of these geographical factors the unobstructed use of the entrances to the St. Lawrence and to the Mississippi were necessarily of paramount impor-

tance to France, but the latter was not menaced and Louisburg once more stood sentinel over the former after Aix-la-Chapelle. Canada was unscathed at the making of that treaty and was passably protected in the eastern regions by existing strongholds. The chief danger point was in the west.

The man to whom goes much of the credit for an able and farseeing policy on behalf of France in America in this period is the Marquis de la Galissonière, governor-general of Canada during the last year of King George's war and for about an equal period after its close.

Heretofore where Canada had touched the English colonies it had been possible to make the same posts serve as defenses, as trading stations, and, in the case of several, as locations for magazines of supplies for the maintenance of the streams of travelers, military and civil, who passed and repassed between the east and the west. From the point where the Ohio valley and the Great lakes substantially diverge from the height of land trending southwestward between them such a policy had not seemed feasible. The chief district for the exploitation of furs lay about and beyond the upper lakes, while the frontier of the region was obviously in the Ohio valley. So long as the valley was not seriously threatened the French had been satisfied to occupy the best and more westerly lines of communication between the Great lakes and the Mississippi. During something more than half a century they had established themselves firmly in turn at the strategic points upon these more attractive routes, which led respectively from Lake Superior via the St. Croix, from Lake Michigan via the Fox and the Wisconsin and also via the Illinois, and from Lake Erie via the Maumee, the Wabash, and the lower Ohio. The greater part of the Ohio valley was yet unoccupied, but its importance as a line of communication was recognized as early as 1739, when the expedition for the relief of Louisiana crossed from Lake Erie to the upper waters of the Ohio and descended that stream to its destination. Longueuil also on that occasion raised the arms of France in the valley in token of the French claim to it.[14]

The occupation of the upper Ohio valley was logically the next

[14] J.-Edmond Roy, *Rapport sur les archives de France relatives à l'histoire du Canada* (*Publications des archives du Canada*, no. 6 — Ottawa, 1911), 273.

step for France, but La Galissonière merits credit for recognizing that the time had come, if it had not already passed, when France should act aggressively for the control of the great valley. In truth, aggressive measures were in order all along the frontiers. The container in which the French had sought to inclose the interior tribes was proving to be a sieve through which English goods poured to the tribes and through which the furs in exchange poured out to English traders. Oswego, a post founded on Lake Ontario by the English a generation since, had become a formidable rival of the French posts for the Indian trade. The Indians from the upper lakes on their way to the English emporium passed by the post of Niagara, at the outlet of the river of that name, into Lake Ontario, and by the post of Toronto on the other side of the lake. The closer relations which the English were able to maintain with the Iroquois both gave the former an advantage in trade and embarrassed any effective effort to keep the interior tribes from going to Oswego along or through the Iroquois country. At the beginning of King George's war the French government ordered that Oswego be destroyed, but the opposition of the Iroquois made this impracticable.[15] La Galissonière wrote to the ministry in the fall of 1747 that Oswego should be destroyed, but he added the caution that the attempt must depend upon the superiority of the French forces and the disposition of the Iroquois.[16]

After the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle the Indians resumed their partially interrupted trade with the English with such avidity that special efforts were made to intercept them. Thus fortifications were erected at Toronto on the short route from the Huron region to Lake Ontario,[17] and a new post was built above the portage around the falls at Niagara.[18] The latter was erected, however, after the more striking enterprise which was undertaken to combat English influence upon the Ohio.[19]

[15] Instructions for La Jonquière, April 30, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 89:172-190.

[16] La Galissonière to minister, October 21, 1747, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, 1747, C[11](I), 87-2:197-198.

[17] La Jonquière and Bigot to minister, October 9, 31, 1749, in *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:34, Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C[11](I), 93:52 ff.

[18] Severance, *An old frontier of France*, 1:374-379.

[19] On the effort to check the English trade with the interior Indians, see *ibid.*, 1:264-276, 374-378, 398-399.

The previous neglect of the Ohio valley by the French made La Galissonière's task a difficult one. The chief object was to eject the English from the valley and to prevent their return. But it was not the wish of the French government to provoke a renewal of the war with England. The measures to be taken must therefore fall short of open hostilities.

The first attempt was to employ the post at Detroit as a check upon the activities of the English to the southward. The suggestion was made in 1747 that Detroit should be supplied with laborers as a means of promoting its growth.[20] When thus supplied it was expected that it would dominate and protect a considerable district. This was declared to be the sole means of preventing the English from establishing themselves upon the Ohio strongly enough to sever the communication between Canada and the Mississippi by that route.[21]

The first task would be to bring under control the tribes in the vicinity of the post who had thrown off restraint during the war.[22] Moreover, the tribes in the vicinity of the mouth of the Scioto were reported to have joined in a sort of republic or commonwealth.[23] Finally, the tribes between the Ohio and the lakes were generally disaffected toward the French; they had in numerous places killed Frenchmen, and, according to rumors which were of uncertain authenticity but which were widely believed in Canada and Louisiana, there was a plot under way to exterminate the French in the whole region. These developments were attributed, with some apparent foundation, to the influence of the English traders.[24] The convoy to the upper posts led by Céloron in 1748 had quieted matters at Detroit[25]

[20] Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 87-2:200.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] Abstract of instructions to La Jonquière, April 30, 1749, in *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:19.

[23] Minister to La Jonquière, May 4, 1749, *ibid.*, 20.

[24] Minister to La Jonquière, April 11, May 4, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 89:69, 223; Raymond to La Jonquière, September 4, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 93:66 ff.

[25] La Galissonière to Maurepas, October 23, 1748, in *Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York* (O'Callaghan, ed.), 10:182.

and St. Pierre in charge of Mackinac had firmly suppressed the natives in his region;[26] but the Ohio valley remained a caldron seething with hostility to the French.

Meanwhile the home government at the beginning of 1749 directed Vaudreuil, governor-general of Louisiana, and La Galissonière, in command in Canada, to be on the lookout for attempts of the English to expand their possessions in America and to oppose any undertakings of that sort.[27]

The situation was tense when La Galissonière asserted that news had reached him that the English, in addition to their previous activities, proposed to build a post in the Ohio valley in 1749.[28] Possibly his plans were already made. In any case, he prepared with his customary energy an expedition to penetrate the region of the upper Ohio. For the command he chose Céloron de Blainville, and the force under him consisted of about two hundred and fifty French and Indians, including twenty French soldiers and one hundred and eighty Canadians.

La Galissonière explained to the ministry that Céloron had orders to drive out the Hurons who had assassinated some Frenchmen and to reclaim some other savages who had departed from their duty, as well as to banish the English traders from the district. He added that the Ohio, which he asserted flowed into the Wabash, clearly belonged to France and that if the English became established there it would give them an approach to the French posts and would open to them the road to Mexico. Céloron was to take possession of the country anew for France and was to note carefully locations for establishments there. To aid in securing accurate and detailed information, the governor-general sent with him the Reverend Père "Bonecamp," a Jesuit and a mathematician. At the same time qualified men were sent to Detroit and "Missilimakinak" to report data regarding those regions. La Galissonière said further that as a step toward the development of the post at Detroit he had sent about forty-five settlers there that spring.[29]

[26] Minister to La Jonquière, May 4, 1749, in *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:22.

[27] Minister to La Galissonière, January 2, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 89:42.

[28] La Galissonière to minister, June 26, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 93:139 ff.

[29] *Ibid.*

The expedition left Lachine on June 15. After an arduous portage from Lake Erie to Lake Chautauqua, it passed down the latter to its outlet, with considerable difficulty made the passage down Conewango creek, and then proceeded down the Allegheny.

The Indians in the neighborhood of the Conewango fled in terror at the approach of the expedition and it seemed probable that the others upon the route might behave in a similar manner. This crisis brought into service Philippe Thomas de Joncaire, the Sir William Johnson of the French. This unusual man, son of a Frenchman and a Seneca squaw, and a member of the Seneca tribe, had much influence with the Iroquois. He appeared, therefore, to the Indians of the Ohio valley, to whom he was known by report, as a quasi envoy of the Iroquois. Joncaire was now sent on ahead to persuade the Indians to remain in their villages by assuring them that the purposes of the French were friendly. Although his mission was only partially successful, he probably did prevent the entire frustration of the purposes of the expedition so far as they related to the Indians. During the earlier part of the course along the Allegheny where the population was sparse the Indians sought safety in flight or came timidly to make a reluctant and apparently insincere submission to the French. At Chiningue, probably Logstown, a good-sized village a little below the forks of the Ohio, the Indians had a more confident air and were flying the flags of both the French and the English. The latter was taken down at the demand of Céloron and a somewhat equivocal promise of agreement with French demands was given.

At the mouth of the Scioto the Indians shortly before Céloron's arrival had constructed a strong fort. They were restrained from burning at the stake Joncaire and others who had been sent ahead, when an Iroquois chief vouched for the peaceful designs of the French. A council held with these Indians resulted in vague and wholly unsatisfactory statements from them. It was at this place that Céloron hoped to be joined by a detachment of Indians from Detroit, but word now arrived that they could not be persuaded to join the expedition.

One more important place remained to be visited: the town and fort where ruled "La Demoiselle," as the French called him, upon the Great Miami, apparently the present Piqua. Here

Céloron attempted to persuade the natives to return to their former village on the Maumee where there was a French post. They excused themselves from compliance until spring but promised to do as requested then. Before the departure of the French, however, the chief, La Demoiselle, became disgruntled and destroyed all confidence in his intention to redeem his promises.

As policy forbade his taking drastic measures, Céloron now continued his course. After destroying the canoes, his men carried their baggage over the long portage to the Maumee, passed down that river to Lake Erie, and, after a stop at Detroit to secure necessaries, retraced their way through the lakes and the St. Lawrence to Montreal, where they arrived on November 10.

The expedition had elicited from the Indians along the Allegheny, the Ohio, and the Great Miami words more or less fair, but no tangible evidences of friendship for the French. The English traders, who were found in every considerable settlement throughout these valleys, were warned to leave the country and they agreed to do so, doubtless with mental reservations. Céloron buried at strategic points leaden plates bearing inscriptions reciting the French title to these regions. He also nailed upon adjacent trees the arms of France. He sent messages by the traders to the governors of Pennsylvania and Carolina warning them of future dangers to English traders who might return to the region. He asserted in his journal that he failed to plunder the traders, as ordered by his instructions, because his force was too weak.[30]

The expedition did not occupy the country and did not have the desired effect upon the minds of Indians and English. It was essentially a reconnaissance in force. It did, however, forecast an intent to seize and hold the great valley for France.

[30] *Expedition of Céloron to the Ohio country in 1749* (Galbreath, ed.), 49. The full journal of Céloron, from which much of the material above upon this expedition has been taken, is presented in Lambing's translation in this work. An abstract of the journal in *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:36-58, is less full. Bonnecamps' journal, from which supplementary material has been drawn, is republished in Galbreath's little volume from the *Jesuit relations and allied documents*, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites (Cleveland, 1896-1901), 69:150-199. On this expedition see also *Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York*, 6:532-533, 548-549, 610-611, 732-733; 7:267; 10:189, 208.

Meanwhile Céloron was being considered for other honors. The commander in the Illinois country had recently died and La Galissonière, writing home from Canada that he was sending Céloron upon the spectacular trip down the Ohio, concluded by saying that if the vacant Illinois post was to be filled by anyone from Canada, he knew of no one better qualified for it than Céloron.[31] The home government, however, had other plans for that veteran. It was just dispatching to Canada a new governor-general, La Jonquière, whose capture and imprisonment in England during the recent war had prevented his taking office earlier and thus had opened the way for La Galissonière's able administration. As an incident to the change in governors a new régime at Detroit was introduced.

Detroit was the key to the western posts of Canada; it guarded the navigation of the upper lakes and also the communications with the Illinois country and the Mississippi. Under these circumstances it was the earnest desire of the government to develop there a self-supporting community, a metropolis of the wilderness, where flocks and herds should abound and where the fertile soil should yield bountiful crops of foodstuffs. Settlers had been encouraged to go there in the hope that they would promote such a development. But in spite of this paternalism the settlement showed a reversion to type as a frontier fortress and trading post.[32]

The expedient of naming a permanent commander at Detroit was considered a hopeful one. La Galissonière's predecessor as governor-general had highly approved the plan but had recommended that it be undertaken in a time of peace. La Galissonière was consulted in the matter and approved the scheme. The home government then approved it upon the theory that a permanent commander would be primarily interested in the growth of the post and would therefore give his best efforts to secure it.[33]

La Galissonière had proposed also that the region to be placed under the commandant of Detroit should include territory to

[31] La Galissonière to minister, June 26, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C^{11}(I), 93:139 ff.

[32] Minister to La Jonquière and Bigot, May 14, 1749, in *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:27.

[33] *Ibid.*

the south and west toward and within the Ohio valley. Such districts were in the valleys of the Maumee, of the Great and the Little Miami, and of the Wabash. With the approval of this plan by the home government a large section of what had formerly been considered the Illinois country was placed under this expanded government of Detroit.[34]

The Illinois country was technically subordinate to Louisiana, under a permanent commandant with large powers. Because of its location between Canada and Louisiana, however, it was regarded as about equally related to both.[35] Troops and supplies were sent upon occasion between it and the Canadian posts, as well as to and from Louisiana.

The expansion of the Detroit government was doubtless the result of the recognition of the increasing importance of the upper and middle Ohio to France and of the natural dependence of the region upon Detroit rather than upon a post on or near the Mississippi. From the point of view of administration this established two frontier governments instead of one. Illinois depended upon Louisiana, and Detroit upon Canada; yet in each case the critical conditions to be met and the distance from the provincial seat of government resulted in conferring upon the commandant permanency of tenure and wide military and civil authority.

The man chosen for this post was Céloron and the appointment was announced by the colonial minister to the new governor-general and to the intendant of New France as La Jonquière was preparing to take his office. The minister announced further that Céloron would have the rank of major with the powers of the commandant of the post of the Illinois.[36] Undoubtedly the choice of a man of Céloron's record and the fact that he was chosen by the home government tended to make him in fact more independent of the governor-general than would otherwise have been the case.

The colonial minister in enumerating the objects to be sought by Céloron in his new office, mentioned primarily that of keep-

[34] Minister to La Jonquière and Bigot, May 14, 1749, in *Wisconsin Historical Collections*, 18:28.

[35] Clarence W. Alvord, *The Illinois country, 1673-1818* (*Centennial history of Illinois*, vol. 1 — Springfield, 1920), 190-192.

[36] Minister to La Jonquière and Bigot, May 14, 1749, in *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:27-28.

ing the nations of the continent in a proper state of mind. As the surest means of accomplishing this end it was directed that Céloron strengthen his post by securing as large a number of permanent settlers as possible. La Jonquière and Bigot were urged to give their assistance toward securing such settlers and they were given the duty of preparing instructions for Céloron for all occasions.[37]

A notification of his appointment sent from the colonial minister to Céloron personally was to the same general effect and stressed as the principal object of his appointment the stimulation of the growth of the post. Céloron was assured that La Jonquière and Bigot would be disposed to second his views upon this matter. In regard to his Indian policy, he would receive orders from the same officials.[38]

In September, 1749, Raymond, commandant on the Maumee, reported that the attitude of all the nations of that region was very bad and was becoming worse. He added that three hundred Englishmen were scattered through the various Indian villages along the Ohio and that they had constructed three forts. The Indians, he reported, had been stirred to defiance by Céloron's expedition, and this attitude was encouraged by the English. The latter offered to join the Indians against the French and had brought them large supplies of powder, ball, and sabers. He reported also much activity on the part of La Demoiselle in enticing the Miami of the Maumee district to his settlement. Finally, he had heard with much and vivid detail reports of the alleged plot to wipe out all the French of the region, including the settlement at Detroit.[39] At the same period it appeared that the same influences were reaching beyond Detroit to the tribes around Mackinac.[40]

Before Céloron returned to Montreal La Galissonière advised La Jonquière, who had meanwhile reached Canada, that the only way to bind the Ohio valley firmly to the French was to establish

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] Rouillé to Cèloron, May 23, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 89:261-263.

[39] Raymond to La Jonquière, September 4, 5, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 93:66-68, 69-71.

[40] La Jonquière to minister, September 20, 1749, *ibid.*, 96.

one or several trading posts there, especially toward the head of the valley.[41] The new governor-general also at first seconded this proposal by asking for more troops, some of whom might be used to garrison much-needed posts near the headwaters of the Ohio to keep open that line of communication with Louisiana and to prevent the carrying on of trade with the English.[42] In the following spring the French minister wrote approving the erection of a post in that district.[43] Meanwhile, when Raymond's report of unrest among the Indians reached La Jonquière, the latter began planning an expedition larger than that of Céloron for the purpose of subduing the unfriendly tribes. He also had the further object of destroying any English forts which might have been built upon lands claimed by France.[44] Thus he turned from a constructive to a purely punitive plan.

Céloron's incumbency as permanent commandant at Detroit was attended by vigorous controversy. The chief difficulty came when La Jonquière decided that the best method of dealing with the continuing unrest in the Ohio valley was to collect a force of French and Indians in the vicinity of Detroit and to use them to make an example of La Demoiselle and his followers on the Great Miami. This plan was not fully matured until 1751 and, meanwhile, the town of La Demoiselle had greatly increased in numbers since the time that Céloron had visited it.[45]

At first the governor-general and Céloron seem to have been agreed that the expedition should be undertaken, but differences soon arose. They held different views as to the proper time for it. They also came to emphasize different aspects of the problem. La Jonquière saw only the need for visiting condign punishment upon savages who had defied French authority,[46] but

[41] La Jonquière to minister, September 20, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 93:96.

[42] *Ibid.*, 88-89.

[43] Minister to La Jonquière, April 15, 1750, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 91:98-99.

[44] La Jonquière to ministry, November 9, 1749, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 93:61 ff.

[45] La Jonquière to Céloron, October 1, 1751, *ibid.*, 97:177 ff.; Longueuil to minister, 1752, in *Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York* (O'Callaghan, ed.), 10:245 ff.

[46] La Jonquière's attitude was undoubtedly in harmony with the instructions of the minister to him on May 4, 1749, but this same document ends with the injunction "to avoid as much as possible all altercations that might result in unpleasant consequences." *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:22-23, 24-25.

Céloron soon became aware that the savage tribes in his neighborhood, though they had agreed in the summer of 1751 to his plans for an expedition against the Miami, had doubts about proceeding with an enterprise which they believed would set the whole valley on fire. They appeared to be ready to help expel the English from the valley, but hesitated to attack the Miami unless they were unequivocally backed by the French. Céloron then intimated that, should the French proceed without the Indians, Detroit would not be safe while the expedition was away.[47] Then came news that plans were under way for a great council of Indian nations from the Hudson to the Mississippi, to be held the following year at the town of La Demoiselle on the Great Miami. If this council were held, there might be good reason for expecting a general conspiracy against the French.[48]

La Jonquière was near frenzy at the failure to proceed and accused Céloron of disobedience of orders. He complained to the ministry that all the measures taken by Céloron might be reduced to doing nothing. He declared that he was inexpressibly chagrined by Céloron's inaction, that he could not sleep, that he was even ill.[49] But La Jonquière felt himself helpless, for Céloron held office not by his (La Jonquière's) appointment but by that of the crown. He therefore recommended that in the future for the good of the service no commandant of a post should be named by the king.[50]

These complaints against Céloron did not meet with entire sympathy in France.[51] The colonial minister had indeed written to the governor-general in 1750 to express the hope that Céloron might be able to drive from the Ohio valley the English traders

[47] La Jonquière to Céloron, October 1, 1751, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 97:177 ff.; Longueuil to minister, 1752, in *Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York* (O'Callaghan, ed.), 10:246, 250.

[48] Upon this proposed expedition see also minister to La Jonquière, May 19, 1750, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 91:122-124; La Jonquière to minister, August 26, 1751, October 29, 1751, November 3, 1751, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 97:34-35, 170 ff., 211.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] Minute of instructions to Duquesne, April, 1752, in *Documents relative to the colonial history of New-York* (O'Callaghan, ed.), 10:243.

as well as the Indians who attracted them to it, but the emphasis was upon the English.[52]

On March 17, 1752, La Jonquière, worn out by anxiety and enfeebled by disease, died at his post and was succeeded by the Baron de Longueuil until a governor should be named from France. This officer took up the plan of La Jonquière to punish the Miami, but he proposed to send an expedition of four hundred men from lower Canada against them by way of Detroit. These, after spending the winter on the Maumee, were to be joined by five hundred more who would then proceed to pacify the tribes of the Ohio and to expel the English traders.[53]

During the following summer the home government named the Marquis Duquesne as the new governor-general and in the instructions given him repudiated specifically the policy of La Jonquière and Longueuil regarding the Ohio valley and directed that upon Duquesne's arrival in America he should arrest the execution of it. This discarded policy was attributed by the minister to the close relations existing between a party in Canada, of whom the Baron de Longueuil was one, and the Iroquois. Instead of seeking to punish recalcitrant tribes it was directed that Indian quarrels were to be avoided so far as was consistent with the dignity of the crown. The efforts of the French should be directed to the expulsion of the English from the valley and should be used against only such Indians as supported the English.[54] In harmony with this policy every effort was to be made to increase the security and usefulness of Detroit by securing and properly supervising as many permanent inhabitants as possible.[55]

This was the policy which the situation demanded and the one which Céloron seems to have had in mind. Meanwhile Longueuil's expedition had been abandoned because of the difficulty of furnishing it with provisions. In place of it, a force of about

[52] Minister to La Jonquière, May 31, 1750, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 91:156-157.

[53] Bigot to minister, May 6, 1752, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C^{11}(I), 98:67 ff.

[54] Rouillé to Longueuil, to Duquesne and Bigot, to Duquesne, July 9, 1752, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 95:156-158, 159, 161-163.

[55] Rouillé to Duquesne and Bigot, July 3, 1752, *ibid.*, 128-129.

two hundred and fifty Indians from Mackinac fell upon the fort of La Demoiselle, destroyed it, and killed the old chief and a number of his followers. These savages were led by Charles Langlade, a half-breed of the wilderness of uncertain status, who, Duquesne afterward declared, not improbably for the purpose of declining official responsibility for the affair, was not in the French service. Such evasion was prudent since the hostilities involved English traders.[56]

This raid upon the village on the Miami was the first real clash in the west in the rivalry of the French and the English in America which developed into the French and Indian war. It has sometimes been called the first battle of that war, but it attracted little attention at the time, and but for the fundamental opposition of interest of the two powers which hurried on mutually aggressive measures in both east and west, it might have been forgotten.

Duquesne later asked for the removal of Céloron from his post at Detroit and finally removed him on the ground of his disobedience to La Jonquière and of a haughty manner toward Duquesne himself,[57] but the ministry would not approve his removal from his majority at Detroit until he was provided with a suitable post at Montreal.[58] Meanwhile the French government approved his policy, which perhaps prevented the French from becoming embroiled in a great Indian war in the west upon the eve of their decisive conflict with the English for the control of the continent.[59]

George A. Wood

Lake Forest College
Lake Forest, Illinois

[56] Longueuil to minister, August 18, 1752, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 98:266-269; Duquesne to minister, October 25, 1752, in *Wisconsin historical collections*, 18:128-131.

[57] Duquesne to minister, October 31, 1753, October 10, 1754, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 99:94-95, 275-277.

[58] [Minister] to Vaudreuil, May 15, 1755, in Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, B 101:89-90.

[59] Bigot wrote home on October 26, 1752, that if the government had remained for another year in the hands of "these gentlemen" (Longueuil and his supporters) as many Indian wars as possible would have taken place. Canadian archives, archives nationales, archives des colonies, Canada, correspondance generale, C11(I), 98:175 ff.

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

Two Westward Journeys of John Filson, 1785

The original of this account of two journeys to Vincennes is one of the four manuscripts in the Filson papers, Kentucky manuscripts, Draper collection, in the library of the State historical society of Wisconsin. Of the other three papers in this volume, one, "A narrative of the defeat on the Wabash, June 2, 1786," has been printed in part by the Filson club;[1] the two remaining ones include a brief journal of a journey from Vincennes to Louisville and a rather more elaborate journal of a voyage from Pittsburgh to Vincennes. Both of these journals consist of mere rough notes that were jotted down from day to day. With the addition of a brief account of a journey to Vincennes in the fall of 1875, they were the basis of a manuscript which Filson evidently intended to publish and which is printed for the first time in the following pages.[2]

While the account of the journeys to Vincennes is unsigned, there is conclusive evidence that the author was John Filson. The handwriting is identical in all four of the manuscripts in this volume, Colonel Durrett accepted these papers without question,[3] and Mr. Draper was "well persuaded" that John Filson wrote the journal of the two trips.[4] This conclusion is strengthened by the title of the journal, for it plainly refers to Filson, whose *Discovery, settlement and present state of Kentucke* was first published in 1784. Moreover, in literary style the journal bears a striking resemblance to other papers by Filson. Such stylistic errors as frequent lapses in spelling, the misuse of capi-

[1] Reuben T. Durrett, *John Filson, the first historian of Kentucky. An account of his life and writings, principally from original sources* (*Filson club publications*, no. 1 — Louisville, 1884), 58-65.

[2] A note in the manuscript of the journey to Vincennes and return, 1786, refers to Filson's expectation of publishing the account of the journeys in 1785. Durrett, *John Filson*, 65, note.

[3] *Ibid.*, 56-57.

[4] A note on the manuscript reads: "Written, I am well persuaded, by John Filson, L. C. Draper."

tals, and many similarly careless blunders in a manuscript which very evidently had not received a final revision agree with Colonel Durrett's strictures upon Filson's numerous errors in English composition.[5] Also, the visions of the future greatness of Pittsburgh and Louisville, the scheme for a shorter route eastward by way of the Great Kanawha, and the keen interest in the details of an unfamiliar country are characteristic of so alert and somewhat visionary an author as John Filson. Typical in similar fashion are the easy and attractive style, the wealth of imagination, and, it must be confessed, a number of errors in facts.

Aside from the intrinsic interest that attaches to any unpublished work of John Filson, the journal is valuable as the account of a farseeing and observant traveler in a region that was then little known to the people of the United States. Especially interesting are the comments upon the Indians of the Wabash valley and upon life at Vincennes, notably the friendly relations between the French and the Indians, which were so rudely interrupted by American lack of tact.

For permission to print the manuscript and for material aid in preparing it for the press, the editor is indebted to the State historical society of Wisconsin and especially to Miss Louise Phelps Kellogg.

BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

[Draper manuscripts 10CC35-46]

A Journal of two Voyages from the falls of Ohio to Post St Vincent[6] on Wabash river Containing a Variety of remarks and inteligence from

[5] Durrett, *John Filson*, 11, 70.

[6] The fort at Vincennes, known by the French as "the Old Fort," was rechristened "Fort Sackville" by the British and by the Americans was given a variety of names—"Post Vincents," "Post of St. Vincenne," "Post Oubache," et cetera. *Annals of the west: embracing a concise account of principal events which have occurred in the western states and territories, from the discovery of the Mississippi valley to the year eighteen hundred and forty five*, compiled by James H. Perkins (Cincinnati, 1846), 40-42; Zadok Cramer, *The navigator: containing directions for navigating the Monongahela, Alleghany, Ohio, and Mississippi rivers; with an . . . account of these . . . waters . . . of their towns . . . To which is added an account of Louisiana, and of the Missouri and Columbia rivers, as discovered by . . . Captains Lewis and Clark* (Pittsburgh, 1808), 237; Henry C. Cauthorn, *A history of the city of Vincennes, Indiana, from 1702 to 1901* ([Cleveland], 1901), 34-37; [John] Law, *The colonial history of Vincennes under the French, British and American governments, from its first settlement down to the*

that remote quarter by the author of a late publication with a few remarks upon the Situation of Pittsburg and the Voyage down to the rapids

Upon my arrival at pittsburg in May 1785 was agreeably amused with the prospect of that infant City being induced to believe that the time is not far distant when this ample plain will bear the lofty towars and the well regulated Streets Shine with Stately Structures [7] The Junction of Aleghany & Monongehela rivers nearly at right angles becomes at once the fountain or source of the great Ohio river, which originally was named Belle riviere or fine river by the french, who also named this town fort-duquesne this [*manuscript torn*] the Vast advantages of the extensive tract of fertile Soil which includes the numerous branches of the affores [d] rivers, has that of lying direct on the great high way which at a short period hence, will direct the traveler across the Country to detroit, thus the land and water passages with an extensive prospect of trade proclaims a future City Surpassing most to be found in the interior parts of asiatic Climes, We now proceeded down the Stream of Ohio, whose Current at this time (being the 27[th] day of May) I Computed at 9 miles an hour but early in Spring I believe it bears 5 or 6 miles an hour from this City to fort Wheeler [8] as appears on Capt [n] Hutchins Map, [9] we pass a great S[e]micircle of above 100 miles the distance by land Computed about 50 [10] We also observe the Country to be hilly, on one, stands fort M[c]Entosh [11] about 80 miles below pittsburgh, (N Side) We

territorial administration of General William Henry Harrison (Vincennes, 1858), 19-20.

[7] Although it is rather flowery, this passage illustrates the keen-sighted vision of one of the founders of Cincinnati. After the close of the revolution, Pittsburgh rapidly developed as the chief stopping place of the westward emigrant. Sarah H. Killikelly, *The history of Pittsburgh; its rise and progress* (Pittsburgh, 1906), 98 ff.

[8] Wheeling, where, by 1782, there were a fort and a few dwellings. James M. Callahan, *Semi-centennial history of West Virginia* ([Charleston], 1913), 25-26.

[9] The best-known map of the Ohio country by Captain Hutchins was prepared in 1764 for Bouquet's expedition. About 1775, Hutchins seems to have published a much more elaborate map which was based upon this earlier one. Thomas Hutchins, *A topographical description of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and North Carolina* (London, 1778), preface; Philip L. Phillips, *A list of maps of America in the Library of congress, preceded by a list of works relating to cartography* (Washington, 1901), 635.

[10] For contemporary accounts of the journey down the Ohio, see "Memoirs of Benjamin Van Cleve," edited by Beverley W. Bond, Jr., in the *Quarterly publication of the Historical and philosophical society of Ohio*, 17:16-17, and Gilbert Imlay, *A topographical description of the western territory of North America* (London, 1792), 56-57.

[11] For Fort McIntosh, see Emilius O. Randall and Daniel J. Ryan, *History of Ohio; the rise and progress of an American state* (New York, 1912-1915), 2:225 ff.,

Could observe the Eastern Side of Ohio Verry hilly but the Western apparently leveler and more fertile, a number of fine Creeks and rivers Constantly uniting their Streams to the majestic Ohio which appeared in no part to move more rapid than usual, awakening that Veneration which must ever affect a beholder by so dignified an aspect, Great Kenhawa forms a Considerable part of this river at whose Junction with Ohio is one the pleasantest Situations in nature. I was induced at this place to take observations with an instrum[t] in order to form a plan and ascertain the breadth of boath rivers was informed that about 90 miles up Kenhawa was a great rapid Conclude that a portage there will be necessary to assist the navigation above and below, and believe this place will be direct in the road that may lead from Philad[a]. to the nearest part of the Kentucke Country and So on in the Straighest direction that possible Can be to the falls of Ohio and may probably afford a better road than any heretofore traveled between those places and Shorten the distance at least 200 miles. [12]

Limestone is the first port of the Kentucke Country we arrived at being a pleasant Situation Surround by [*manuscript torn*] extensive tracts of fertile Country, here is a town laid off and Some houses erected the place affords encouragement to inhabitants for trade having the advantage of the emigration from above and a fine road through the interior parts of Kentucke [13] from this we pass down to the rapids, with only this observation that the Country affords a Verry agreeable prospect on either Side and the Stream more increased in depth than breadth being little difference in that respect for upwards of one thousand miles this post [14] we must View as the Metropolis of the Western Country, not so much from its natural advantages as disadvantages, as many other parts not far distant would be Vastly more Suitable were it not for the rapids, which will ever induce navigators to Stop, either from real or imaginary danger in passing them, it being well know that for more than half the Year there is great difficulty in passing and real danger without a Skillful pilot, but to those who are acquainted with the Channel there is little danger even at low water, I have gone through it twice when

and *Frontier defense on the upper Ohio, 1777-1778*, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites and Louise P. Kellogg (Madison, 1912), 298.

[12] Cramer, *The navigator* (1808 ed.), 55; "Memoirs of Benjamin Van Cleve" (Bond, ed.), in the *Quarterly publication of the Historical and philosophical society of Ohio*, 17:29-34, note 34.

[13] The blockhouse at Limestone (i.e., Maysville), was built in 1784 and the little settlement quickly became an important port on the Ohio. Lewis H. Collins, *History of Kentucky* (Covington, 1874), 2:20, 555, 557.

[14] The first settlement at Louisville was made in 1778 and by 1790 Jefferson county had a population of 4,765. *Ibid.*, 2:20, 258.

the water was full as low as ever known without receiving damage observing a few Small rocks which probably might be removed with inconsiderable expence although this may be a useless information to the Multitudes acquainted with every circumstance[15] Yet the Citizen the Stranger or the world acquainted therewith may in a liesure hour Survey the extensive tract and find instruction and amusement, agreeable to our intentions we leave the falls or rapids of Ohio with only this observation that the Spacious plain of Louisville inhabited about 12 Years is probably the foundation of one of the greatest Cities on earth which although not the most healthy Situation, is Yet so central in the Western Country with the interesting disadvantage affores, [d] Situate on the bank of this fine river directing the multitudes of travelers along her Streets by the great roads leading from every part of the Eastern States to the Illinois Country Situate directly westward in which we Visit Post St Vincent, hereafter described, about 100 miles distant, and Kaskaskia and Several other french towns about 250 miles westward (of the latter) near the Mississipi

A Voyage to Post St Vincent by water may be Computed at 250 [450] [16] miles- by land not more than 100 from the falls of Ohio, The Wabash or Ouabache is Computed at 318 miles below the falls, in Sailing 150 miles we frequently observe hills, but the Country on either side affords a most agreeable prospect, from that distance we Sail down what is Called the low Country Scarcely perceiving a hill in all the remaining part to oubache difficult Sailing in many parts at low water on account of Sand Shoals, We pass only 3 rivers in this distance two large ones on the eastern Side Viz Salt and Green rivers and a Small one one [on] the West Called blue river, [17] from the Colour of the water with a Vast Number of Creeks With all these accumulation of water, Ohio is not but little more in breadth than it is above 100 miles above the rapids [18]

Abundance of Cane & herbage is seen along this river and numerous herds of buffalo feeding Carelessly upon the banks these Varietys afford something agreeable and delightful, as we gently descend the Stream, having but little more to do besides looking out to prevent dan-

[15] Hutchins, *Topographical description of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and North Carolina*, 10, and a plan of the rapids opposite page 10; Imlay, *Topographical description of the western territory of North America*, 63-64, 111.

[16] From the falls of the Ohio to the mouth of the Wabash it is 317½ miles and Vincennes is 150 miles up the latter river. Cramer, *The navigator* (1808 ed.), 71-78; (1817 ed.), 236-237.

[17] This probably refers to the Big Blue river, which flows into the Ohio from the Indiana side about thirty-seven miles below Louisville.

[18] "Memoirs of Benjamin Van Cleve" (Bond, ed.), in the *Quarterly publication of the Historical and philosophical society of Ohio*, 17:46-48.

ger and therefore are at liesure to Contemplate those objects which Continually Visionate themselves.

We were frequently invited to shore by the rattleing noise of large [*manuscript torn*] of the bank near [*manuscript torn*] we found these Cold & agreeably tasted, but were apprehensive they might proceed from ponds near the river being Confirmed in this opinion by observing Such places near the river where the Streams issued, and Consequently might be Visiated by putrid matter in those Stagnated waters although they were at this Season dry Yet if the Channel of the river was replenished with water, these ponds would be filled therefore we Conclude there are Subterranean Streams which not find[g] Vent in the river Swell the into hollows near, and form ponds, I frequently went on Shore for discoveries, and found the Soil amazingly fertile observed that honey Suckles were exceeding plenty, discovered the Catolopy [catalpa] tree of large growth the Cotton [cottonwood] tree as frequent as any other Species, and a tree of large growth, of which kind I have not Seen any before or Since but doubtless possessing rare & Valuable qualities for from its trunk proceeded a gum of aromatic, and on its branches multitude of Small balls which were then green but afforded the most delicious Smell that I ever experienced in nature way so exquisite was the effluvia that I really conceived a respiral healing and pleasure perhaps a Curious enquiry of the Valuable qualities of the tree may yet be interesting to mankind.[19]

But we will (will) turn our boat to the Stream of Wabash which must be asscended and to which we arrived in Seven Days the difference between Descending and asscending a Stream is so different, that like a Change from prosperity to adversity we feel so much of the disagreeable that our Verry Natures are Soured and losses the pleasure in the pain. Thus we proceeded to asscend ouabache which from its mouth to the Post has the most uniformity of any Stream I ever beheld the Current much the same as Ohio with Six or Seven Small rapids in that distance which may be Computed at 150 miles, as the french have it, marking in its Course 50 points which upon the whole are Counted each one league We asscended this in eleven days which might have been performed in half that time as the french frequently do, who are acquainted with the Channel, the land on either side exceeding fertile abounding with Cotton trees & every Species of timber the land mostly level and Subject to be overflowed by the Spring floods to a Considerable extent, we were un-

[19] Of the trees found in this region, the juniper answers most nearly to this highly imaginative and alluring description. Daniel Drake, *Natural and statistical view, or picture of Cincinnati and the Miami country* (Cincinnati, 1815), 81, 85; Charles S. Sargent, *Manual of the trees of North America* (Boston, 1922), 88-89.

accustomed to indians and here we met numbers every day floating in Cannoes, or encamped on the rivers bank all we saw appeared friendly [20] our most intimate acquaintances Could not have discovered stronger evidences of friendship & Satisfaction than they, every individual must Shake hands with them, we were ever ready to keep fair weather generally presenting them with flower, Salt, or tobacco, &c and they in return frequently gave us flesh, fish, & fowl, these friendly exchanges never failed to ensure friendship and a hearty farewel and as none of us Could speak the indian language we became perfectly acquainted with Signs as no people perhaps on earth are so happy in Conveying their ideas in that manner as the indians whose languages being probably less Supplied with Verbs than ours the defect is made up with motions of the body & members.

one day a number of their pirouges hove in Sight & according to their Custom a gun was fired to know whether we were friends or foes, as it appears that answering with a gun is a mark of friendship We being unacquainted with this fired no gun, and observed the indians to hurry on Shore requiring us to Come to them which we answered by Signs desiring them to Come to us; they Complied and advancing to us, we met them with every mark of good nature and proposed to present them with some of our provisions, they appeared pleased except one and the Sign, being given for all to move on Shore, upon landing, the indian who appeared Sour and by his ornaments might be Suposed to be a prince drew out a large knife and advanced up to one of our Compans (who was no ways Suspicious) in a resolute manner as if a mortal Stab might be the Consequence, but all on a Sudden from what Cause may be uncertain he turned his weapon aside and took him by the hand in a friendly manner, this he might be induced to by observing one of us (a good woodsman) & acquainted with indian Customs to keep his gun in order for immediate execution; however the Scene ended in friendship & we gave them Chearfully & bountifully & departed.

We arrived safe at Post St Vincent found the inhabitants friendly, was agreeably amused with the prospect of this place which I was informed had been Settled by french above 120 years [21] and probably may number at present upwards of 300 houses, most of which make a poor appear-

[20] Cauthorn, *History of Vincennes*, 35; Imlay, *Topographical description of the western territory of North America*, 76; Paul C. Phillips, "Vincennes in its relation to French colonial policy," in the *Indiana magazine of history*, 17:335-337.

[21] Vincennes was probably founded about 1731. For a discussion of the exact date, see *Annals of the west* (Perkins, ed.), 40-41; Cauthorn, *History of Vincennes*, 34; Law, *Colonial history of Vincennes*, 11-12; Jacob B. Dunn, *Indiana*, 50; Dunn, "The Mission to the Wabash," in Indiana historical society, *Publications*, 3:279.

ance but in general are Convenient and Clean within as there is perhaps no people in the world more friendly and Cleanly than the french. I paid my respects to the first families in the place was politely treated and in a few days formed a tolerable acquaintance, enquired into their political Constitution and Commercial Circumstances, was informed that the british troops under Conduct of Gov.[r] Hamilton had been reduced by Gen.[l] Clark and the inhabitants taken the oath of allegiance to the State of Virginia that the State had placed John Todd Esq.[r] a deputy Gov.[r] there for one year, who by the authority invested in him, had Constituted and Comissioned a number of Magistrates to form a Court and appointed Col.[o] Legras Commandant and Judge of the Court, had also appointed a Surveyor and a register for landed affairs, and thus business had been Conducted for some time without any disturbance, upon every View & information of this Country [22] I was much pleased therewith as indeed it is worthy of the highest commendations and the fame thereof having been Spread through the back Settlements by travelers Some time before, a number of families was induced to emigrate thither these having Spiritous liquor with them found interest and a Suport by trading in that article with the indians they being excessively fond thereof, by the freedom of the trade debauched themselves and Confused the town, this induced the Court by express mandate under large fines to prohibit the baneful traffick, and notwithstand[g] the Strictest watch of Such Conduct, many of the inhabitant both french & Americans were Constantly employed in a Clandestine trade though Some were detected and Suffered the Consequence but notwithstanding it might originate from laudable motives [23] Yet it became the prime Mover of all the disturbance in that Country, for Jealousies arose with the people that the Court Secretly practised a trade in liquor with the indians and boldly asserted what was alledged, the Court was di[s]affected with the people for their assertions and began to experience their disobediance too frequently, the indians also began to take advantage of the ordinance with the American people and quarrels ensued, which frequently had a mortal issue Civil authority in a detached situation is ever precarious, frequently

[22] Cauthorn, *History of Vincennes*, 46-48; Law, *Colonial history of Vincennes*, 39; William W. Hening, *Statutes at large, being a collection of all the laws of Virginia, 1619 to 1792* (Richmond, 1819-1823), 9:552-555. For a fuller description of these events, see *Cahokia records, 1778-1790*, edited by Clarence W. Alvord (*Collections of the Illinois state historical library*, vol. 2 — Springfield, 1907), introduction.

[23] In this connection, note the attempts in colonial Pennsylvania to control the liquor trade with the Indians. Charles A. Hanna, *The wilderness trail; or the ventures and adventures of the Pennsylvania traders on the Alleghany path, with some new annals of the old west, and the records of some strong men and some bad ones*, 2:304-306.

depending on the Caprice of the people, without the sanctions of the Military to support the dignity of the Civil, the Constitution of Post St Vincent at this time, was in this unhapy Situation all officers civil and military was removed except a Court and Commandant who was considered as Chief Judge of the Civil Power this was sufficient with a people naturaly obedient to authority as the french nation are reputed, for although Numbers of the inhabitants live as Savages in some respects and many are intermarried with them, Yet there are a number of genteel people, and even Situate so great a Distance from the Civilized world surrounded by many indian nations, they general[ly] Conduct with a degree of politeness so natural and Common to the french Nation [24] These people by a long acquaintance with their indian neighbors have Contracted a friendship and acquaintance which time will never be able to irradicate for by the best accounts I Could have, it is near 130 years Since the town was first inhabited which is perhaps of an earlier date than the City of Philadelphia, the Story runs thus, a french Gent[n] Called M.[r] Vincent a bold penetrating adventurous man and perhaps a trader, removeing from Canada up the lakes by means of the Comunication of these rivers and being acquainted with the Piankishaw indians residing near where the Post now Stands they invited him to Settle amongst them by a gift of land which the present inhabitants presume to be much larger than it then really was and Could not be more from what I learnt than 8000 acres for the great plain on which he Settled does not exceed 10,000 acres and the indians reserved of that perhaps 2000 for their town and farms, as the Villages were adjoining the french gave theirs the present name [25] the indians Called theirs Gibacohque and the river now Called ouabache was then St. Jerome, the town being planed a great number of traders was induced to remove from Canada to settle there on acc.[t] of the immense advantages of the indian trade which in peltries and furs Could not be equalled by any other part and finding the Country exceeding fertile and healthy and well watered it became an object of Publick notice and was therefore Considered as one of the dependencies of Canada by the french, Who Claimed all the Country west of the Aleghany Mountains and Called the whole Vandalia. [26] If this be

[24] Cauthorn, *History of Vincennes*, 40-44; Law, *Colonial history of Vincennes*, 15 ff.

[25] Cauthorn, *History of Vincennes*, 34; Logan Esarey, *A history of Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1915-1918), 1:27; Law, *Colonial history of Vincennes*, 11-12.

[26] The name "Vandalia" seems first to have been used by the company that was formed in London in 1766 to colonize in the western country. Clarence W. Alvord, *The Mississippi valley in British politics; a study of the trade, land speculation, and experiments in imperialism culminating in the American revolution* (Cleveland, 1917), 2:119-120.

considered in some measure a digression from our narrative, it may be satisfactory but I return to the moment of my first departure from the Post which was in august 1785 and having Stayed but a few days projected with a friend who I met there to go to Kentucke and return again to the Post on a trading Voyage, to effect this tour through the woods as we were entirely unacquainted, it was necessary to hire indian guides, which for a few bottles of Whisky was soon procured, the Vermillion Chief his adopted Son and a Delaware offered their Service, these with a french Gent.[n] who understood their language were our Companions and perhaps the best in Such a Situation that the world could afford, I Cannot Say that I ever was suspicious or had the least reason to be so of any ill design by them, on the Contrary they manifested the greatest Care & friend[p] hunted for us, Cooked our food, and watched our nocturnal hours to prevent surprise, the old Chief was pleased to Call me his son and gave me the name of Muchoowoch which in his language was a Wolf, this man was of a remarkable honest penetrating ingenuous, friendly disposition, as I experienced more afterward, many remarks of friendship induced me to regard him, numerous were the branches he broke off to prevent their Striking or tearing me as I rode after him, and frequently wishing he Could Converse with me, upon this I reflected that a good Disposition and repeated kindness are Great unducements to solid friendship abstracted from every other motive. Without regard to Colour or nation or language, We arrived at the falls of ohio in 9 Days the Country through which we passed have a diversity of Soil but in no part so fertile as Kentucke,[27] nor so well watered as might be desired, as extensive tracts are dry brushy Pareries and Scarce of timber a river whose water is of a blueish appearance but from what Cause I know not runs through this Country into Ohio[28] and another Called reviere la Blanch or White river runs into ouabach 12 leagues below the Post, the head branches of this river I am well told are but about 12 miles from Ohio above the rapids and by a Small portage may form a water passage aCross the Country into ouabache which no doubt will answer a more Valuable purpose for transporting property than a great road,[29] the difference between a land & water Carryage I saw plainly exemplifyed

[27] For Filson's trip across the same region about a year later, see Durrett, *John Filson*, 65.

[28] Probably the Big Blue river, which has already been mentioned. See *ante*, note 17.

[29] Filson's geography is here somewhat at fault, in as much as the White river flows southwesterly from central Indiana, but his prophecy regarding the Wabash route was later fulfilled. Elbert J. Benton, *The Wabash trade route in the development of the old northwest* (*Johns Hopkins university studies in historical and political science*, series 21, nos. 1 and 2 — Baltimore, 1903).

in that Country, for from the rapids of Ohio to Danville in Kentucke is about 80 miles by land and from the rapids to Post St Vincent by water is above 450, Yet 12 Shillings pr. hundred w.[t] is the freight of the latter, and 20 Shillings the Carriage of the former, the Ohio and Wabash as [are] perhaps the best rivers in the Western Country for navigation and therefore promise Considerable advantages by trade as by a Small portage of 16 miles between ouabache & the mamia [*Maumee*] of the lake form a Compleat Conveyance of property from detroit to Post St. Vincent which is Computed at the distance of 700 miles.

In the fall of the year we proceed.[d] on our Voyage to the Post, the dry season reduced the rivers Verry low great difficulty in Sailing them arrived at the Post about Christmas, found a Considerable alteration in the disposition of the people which increased affertwards to an entire di[s]affection, the Magisteril ordinance prohibiting the Sail of the noxious Juices had kindled a Spirit of Jelousy and aspersion between the french and americans there, of the latter there might be 60 families, so that a hovering Cloud pregnant with innumerable evil was obvious over Post St Vincent, the indians also began to quarrel with the americans and frequent murders ensued,[30] this kind of Violence I found was no ways uncommon for a few days after I was Settled there a french man who lived near me was murdered and laid at my door in the night, perhaps the perpetrator of this horrid action might have Some design as I was a Stranger, but the better Sort of people being so prejudiced in my favor it rather turned to my advantage[31] the deed being done, no enquiry was made, how he came by his death a thousand formalities at his interment and having no heirs but much property the Court undertook the administration of his estate, and found a method to monopolize it for their own, no people on earth live more chearfully than the people of this place balls and reveling take their nightly round, Vice and profanity become Common and habitual, the Court became in Some measure the ridicule of the people by a prostitution of their Characters to Gambling & Luxury, which brought on a general revolt from their authority.

[30] Durrett, *John Filson*, 62-64.

[31] In reality this was a grim frontier joke which the victim, Filson, altogether failed to appreciate. *Ibid.*, 55.

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

The land of the Miamis. An account of the struggle to secure possession of the northwest from the end of the revolution until 1812. By Elmore Barce. (Fowler, Indiana: The Benton review shop, 1922. xiii, 422 p.)

The Miami country comprehended what is now the state of Indiana with a liberal extent into what is now Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. Besides this ample range the Miami hunted in Kentucky. When the revolution opened, they had had very little acquaintance with the Americans. In the campaigns of George Rogers Clark they took little active part. During the period 1780 to 1816, when they were in close contact with the on-coming frontier, a feeling of deadly hostility arose. During this period no region of the world exceeded in natural bounty the Miami land. For this home the Miami were soon forced to fight not only the American settlers but various refugee Indian tribes. The interference of the British prevented any amicable adjustment and urged the Indians on to their ruin. From this struggle emerged a number of frontier heroes, of whom Harrison was the greatest, and a number of celebrated Indian warriors, of whom Tecumseh is best known. Such is the theme of Mr. Barce's story. He has been collecting and culling his materials for several years. He is personally acquainted with every feature of territory and is well equipped from his profession to weigh the evidence. He writes in a strong, clear style. There is no doubtful sentiment, nor lack of authority in his writing. It is an interesting subject and a valuable book.

LOGAN ESAREY

The life of Clara Barton, founder of the American red cross. By William E. Barton. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1922. 348, 388 p. $10.00)

Much as Clara Barton was in the limelight some twenty years ago, she is fast becoming a forgotten figure. As late as 1912 the great woman war worker of Lincoln's time was a well-known personage in the city of Chicago. Now she is gone; and, but for these excellent books, she would be seldom mentioned. Two things have blurred the vision of history: the great and exciting agitation that the world has recently passed

through, and the long and sometimes violent discussion of the woman movement. One of the best-known of all the women of her country is, like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, almost forgotten. If this be true, who has a chance of that immortality which all men crave?

It is then a timely thing, the appearance of these two volumes and the renewed emphasis upon the life and work of one who deserves so well of her fellow men. The editor of these letters and the author of these chapters wonders plaintively whether Miss Barton could ever have been so obtuse as Clara proves herself to have been in 1859. She wrote to her brother in that year:

It will be a strange pass when the *Bartons* get fanatical, and cannot abide by and support the laws they live under, and mind their own business closely enough to remain anywhere they may chance to be. I am grieved and ashamed of the course which our Northern people have taken relative to the John Brown affair . . . if our Southern neighbors clasp their rights all the firmer, when assailed, and plant the foot of resistance toe to toe with the foot of aggression, it is not for *us* to complain of it; what differently should we ourselves do?

The author is apparently distressed by these very positive sentences. He need not be. Lincoln wrote in similar vein. He spoke in 1854 similar words. And the *Bartons,* the well-to-do and the well-placed people of the north to-day, agree with Miss Barton of 1859. What do such say now when radicals talk of abolishing the constitution, as did the followers of John Brown?

And Miss Barton could write in her *diary,* too, for on the day of Lincoln's assassination she wrote:

Look at the state of things, both civil and military, that curse our Government. The pompous air with which little dishonest pimps lord it over their betters. Contractors ruining the Nation, and oppressing the poor, and no one rebukes them. See a monkey-faced official, not twenty rods from me, oppressing and degrading poor women who come up to his stall to feed their children, that he may steal with better grace and show to the government how much his economy saves it each month. . . . Congress knows it, but no one can see that it will make votes for him at home by meddling with it; the Cabinet know it, but people who live in glass houses must not throw stones. So it rests, and the women live lighter and *sink lower,* God help them. . . . A general lays a dishonest plot to be executed with human life. He is to create a Senator, some Memberships, a Governor, commissions, and all the various offices of a state, and the grateful recipients are to repay the favor by gaining for him his confirmation as Major General.

That is a dark picture. The worst of it is, there is no exaggeration in the story; if only she, like John Quincy Adams, had given names and dates. But her apparent faith in Henry Wilson from Massachusetts is

disappointing, for he was one of the gang, though perhaps not one of the worst.

These quotations do not show the great work of Clara Barton. Her two tasks in life were the nursing of union soldiers who were wounded and stood in need of help, and the founding of the red cross, which has performed so many wonders during the three or four decades of its history. What Miss Barton did and suffered during the great campaigns of the civil war is carefully told in these pages; and there are numerous letters that attest her common sense and practical heroism. When the war closed, she set up at Annapolis as the guardian and friend of soldiers unable to get back home or otherwise in need of help.

When the Franco-Prussian war set armies in motion again, Miss Barton, true to her instinct, hastened to the danger centers seeking to be of assistance. It was in this way that she united with some Swiss friends to organize the red cross. It took a little time for officers of the two contending armies to realize that there was any place for such as she on the field of battle. But she pressed her cause and won her point. Her work in Europe was hardly less heroic than that which distinguished her career during the American war.

The problem of organizing the red cross occupied her attention for many years; and during the long struggle she came into contact with generals, presidents, and senators, officials who must be shown that anything new could ever be. The letters she received doubtless would make important historical material. Some of them have been published in these volumes; but one gets the feeling that the most important items have yet to come to light.

Doctor Barton has performed a useful work; he has made familiar again one of the greater women figures of American history. And the publishers have done a good piece of printing, for the paper and the type are both pleasing to the eye, as one reads. Let us hope the Barton family is not to be bankrupted by the pious and useful performance.

WILLIAM E. DODD

The declaration of independence. A study in the history of political ideas. By Carl Becker. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and company, 1922. 286 p.)

In an age of world upheaval and revolution like the present, it is appropriate that a new book on the American declaration of independence should make its appearance. Undoubtedly Americans of to-day have lost touch with the spirit and purposes of the framers of the declaration of independence, and nine out of the ten who quote confidently and incorrectly the phrase "all men are created free and equal" believe

that they are quoting from the United States constitution. Several years ago Mr. H. L. Mencken sought to give new vitality to the ancient declaration by translating it from the original tongue into the American vulgate, the result being indicated sufficiently well by the opening sentence of the revised version: "When things get so balled up that the people of a country have to cut loose from some other country, and go it on their own hook, without asking no permission from nobody, excepting maybe God Almighty, then they ought to let everybody know why they done it, so that everybody can see they are on the level, and not trying to put nothing over on nobody." Now comes Mr. Carl Becker, who approaches the same task from a different point of view and who has given us a book that is the product of ripe reflection, shrewd insight, and careful scholarship. Not all of the facts presented in the book are new; perhaps most of them have been stated elsewhere; but they are worth repeating and they never have been said better. Indeed, lay critics who have been inclined to regard the historian's literary style as an occupational disease should be required forthwith to acquaint themselves with the lucid and engaging diction of which Mr. Becker is a master.

The author treats the declaration as a written memorandum of what was in the minds of all thoughtful American liberals in 1776. There is nothing novel in this approach, of course; but in accounting for the contents of the declaration, he gives an excellent brief history of the natural rights philosophy and by far the best account of the unfolding of American constitutional theory, 1763-1776, that the reviewer has knowledge of. Elsewhere in the volume he traces the textual evolution of the declaration, analyzes and evaluates its literary quality, and considers the declaration as a piece of polemic literature. The final chapter deals with the waning of the natural rights philosophy in the nineteenth century.

The book is written with so high a degree of detachment that one sometimes receives an impression of the author in the rôle of an entomologist studying a quivering specimen impaled with a pin. Indeed, the author does not give the whole story of the declaration of independence, for those parts are omitted which would contribute most vividly to re-creating the mental and emotional stress under which the colonists labored on the eve of independence. Nothing is said of the heated discussions over independence which went forward in the columns of the American newspapers in 1775-1776 and which canvassed every aspect of the question — economic, philosophical, political, and religious. An analysis of these articles would remove the impression of the ready public acceptance of the declaration, which one might carry away from Mr.

Becker's book. Tom Paine's part in crystallizing public opinion and destroying an illusion of the kingship which the earlier pamphleteers had deliberately constructed is ignored. Nor is anything said about the dramatic struggle in congress over the adoption of the resolution of July 2.

The brief discussion of the subsequent fortunes of the natural rights philosophy is exceedingly stimulating; and it may be hoped that this suggestive introduction to the subject may incite some one to undertake a more detailed examination of the subject.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER

The agricultural bloc. By Arthur Capper. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and company, 1922. vii, 171 p.)

Historians will be inclined to look upon a book on *The agricultural bloc* by no less a person than Senator Capper himself, now chairman of the bloc, and from the beginning one of its leaders, as in the nature of primary source material. The first two-thirds of it qualifies as source material because it gives us the frame of mind and understanding of the existing agricultural situation of one of the twelve senators who met at Washington at the office of the American farm bureau federation on May 9, 1921, and organized the group which popular writers were presently calling the "bloc." The last third of it qualifies as source material because in it Senator Capper outlines authoritatively the activities of the bloc from May to the end of the session, the period during which were passed the futures trading act, the packer control act, and the coöperative marketing act, as well as two amendments to the farm loan act, an amendment to the federal reserve act providing for an agricultural representative on the board, and an amendment to the war finance corporation act providing for loans to agriculture. The twelve senators will forgive us if we do not have all their faith in the potency of these measures to lift agriculture out of the Slough of Despond. Nevertheless, Senator Capper is surely right in saying that if the bloc had never been formed, congress would still be talking about these measures. The bloc did get action, at a time when action was very much needed, at least by the administration.

Senator Capper renders a service by speaking clearly on a few points upon which there is some confusion. He says on one point: "In fact, it was hardly necessary for the group to make a more definite program than merely to unite on non-partisan lines in support of agricultural measures when they came before the senate" (page 143). Thus the bloc was a loose organization without a definite program. Again, he says that the group did not specifically regard the revenue bill, with its fight

over the excess profits tax, a part of its program (page 157). Lastly, he points out that the "farm tariff bloc," so called, was a different group from the regular bloc, though it included many of the same senators. He even goes as far as to say that the tariff had never been a part of the bloc's program (page 148). This statement seems extreme, for as late as August, 1921, Senator Kenyon was trying to work out a tariff program for the bloc and even called for outside assistance upon it, which was duly provided for him for two months. Moreover, when the "farm tariff bloc" did split off a few weeks later, under the leadership of the rampant protectionist, Senator Gooding of Idaho, it appeared to the public as the tariff committee of the bloc, and even paraded itself as such for a short period. Senator Capper was willing to follow Senator Gooding's lead in this matter. Senator Kenyon never was.

Senator Capper, in his analysis of the agricultural situation in the first ten chapters, and in his program for agriculture in the last chapter, virtually outlines a national agricultural policy. His first premise is a good one, namely, that the nation has "passed into a new economic era in which the balance between agriculture and the other industries must be more carefully safeguarded" (page 11). But presently we discover that safeguarding the balance means to him keeping the population about equally divided between farm and city, or at least preventing any further decrease in the percentage of the population living on farms. The "impending decline" in agriculture which disturbs him is a decline in the proportion of the population living on farms. He says that "a continued growth in commercial and industrial America, if accomplished by reaching out to distant countries for food, would be accompanied by a decline of the American farmer to a lower grade of living" (page 20). This last statement gives the clue to his program of amelioration. Improvements in marketing, credit, and transportation are to help greatly. They will reduce the number living in cities from the profits of handling the farmers' products. But after all, the real solution is tariff protection for agriculture. We must allow no food nor textiles to be imported which can be produced at home. To be sure, a tariff does not help with most farm products at present; but the time is soon coming when we will cease to export them, and we must have our protection ready well in advance.

The foregoing is hardly a fair sample of the quality of Senator Capper's understanding. He reasons thus poorly only when he is dealing with questions with broader economic aspects such as the tariff, price levels, the incidence of freight costs, the distribution of the benefits of improvements, the relation between farm population and farm incomes.

There is much good analysis of the concrete immediate aspects of agricultural finance, coöperative marketing, and the like.

Above all, in using this volume, one must not forget that Senator Capper is a republican statesman.

J. D. Black

A history of commerce. By Clive Day. [Revised and enlarged.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and company, 1922. x, 676 p. $2.50)

That this well-known and useful manual should have a war edition is not surprising, when one remembers the prominence of the author in the conference at Versailles. The year 1914 is taken to be an important turning point in the history of commerce, but this position is neither demonstrated nor proved. The new part of the book contains five chapters on exports, imports, transportation, and finance in European countries and in the United States during the period 1914-1920. As in the older part, so in the new, there is a notable absence of information about internal trade, storage, and the informal organization of demand and supply. The treatment of the obvious in commerce makes the book unsatisfactory for advanced students but eminently suitable for beginners in history or economics.

The foundations of American nationality. By Evarts Boutell Greene. (New York: The American book company, 1922)

New college textbooks in history are commonly advertised as "entirely different"; but there are so many new ventures that it is now becoming difficult to hit upon a new idea. A publisher's agent recently informed me that the text he represented was written from a "new point of view," which was that it "omitted much of the factual material." It did. Needless to say Professor Greene has not attempted to write history, even for college students, by omitting the facts. He knows that the students can be relied upon to do that for themselves. He has endeavored to provide them with a "manual which will embody . . . the enlarged knowledge and the new points of view made possible by the results of research in recent years." I sometimes wish I had written a college textbook so that I might be in a position to say that the best college text in history is the worst — that the idea is in itself a pernicious one. Not being free to say that, I will say that if it is well that college students should have a manual of facts, well selected, conveniently arranged, presented in readable form and with judicious comment, with marginal word guides and excellent suggestions for the "further reading" which students do not do because the text makes it unnecessary — if college students ought to have such

a text, then this one is the best there is for American colonial history. Professor Greene's volume is intended to be used with the volume by Professor Fish on *The development of American nationality,* which was published in 1913; and the two volumes together constitute probably the best college text on American history. The most serious criticism likely to be made by teachers is that Professor Greene's book on the colonial period is longer by some fifty pages than that of Professor Fish. These books, like most college texts in history, are designed also for the "general reader." If the general reader needs to know history, Professor Greene's book will "meet the requirements" of such a reader; but it probably will not meet his desires. It will be found to contain too many facts, and to be too accurate, restrained, and qualified in the presentation to arouse and hold the attention of that much-sought but elusive creature.

CARL BECKER

The Bozeman trail. Historical accounts of the blazing of the overland routes into the northwest, and the fights with Red Cloud's warriors. By Grace Raymond Hebard and E. A. Brinistool, with an introduction by General Charles King, U.S.V. Two volumes. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark company, 1922. 346, 306 p.)

These are welcome and confusing volumes. No one knows the history of Wyoming better than Professor Hebard, whose name is given first of the co-authors. For many years she has been a devoted laborer in the fields of Indian romance and western antiquarian investigation. She has classified the facts relating to Wyoming with a thoroughness that is a thing for emulation by other scholars in near-by states. And in this new work she has made a positive contribution to our knowledge.

The Bozeman trail was a minor thoroughfare among the roads of the western plains. Like many a struggling modern railroad it suffered from lack of terminals. It began near Julesburg, Colorado, and ended at Virginia City, Montana. It picked up what was a local traffic, and delivered it after rough adventure in a region that grew slowly and from other causes. The California trail, the Oregon trail, and the Santa Fe road have all received more detailed attention than this. They began earlier, lasted longer, and carried their thousands for the scores that traveled the Bozeman route. But none of them had a more varied life. It is typical of the main continental routes that the Indians soon gave up the hopeless task of withstanding the rush of migration. The outbreaks of 1864 were the only troubles that for a long time put a major trail out of use. Along the Bozeman trail, however, the Indian was never reconciled. The very first travelers found the

Sioux menacing. The efforts of the army to police and protect failed, and the war department permitted the efforts of its forces to be hampered by the need for caring for the women and children that were allowed to be taken to the field by husbands in the service. The inefficiency of American Indian administration is nowhere more clearly visible. Eventually Red Cloud, the great chief who made the defense of eastern Wyoming his life work, had the rare satisfaction of forcing the United States to withdraw from his domain. There are few occasions in Indian relationships when the white gave back what he had taken. The retreat of the United States and the dismantling of the Wyoming forts is a notable event.

The authors of this treatise have gathered their material from varied sources. They have gone into government documents and they have drawn upon the shrinking volume of personal recollections. Men who knew the details of the Bozeman trail were not too numerous in 1866. After the lapse of half a century they are sadly few. The reader knows that their tales have been drawn upon, but nowhere in the volumes does he find any discussion of the historic value of their evidence, or any critical attempt to check the facts. The chapters are not numbered; and until it appears from the internal evidence, there is uncertainty as to whether the authors have written a passage or have printed bodily from some contemporary. The materials are here for a vivid history of the Bozeman trail, or for a life of Jim Bridger; but they are in notebook form. They are served with running comment of romance. The illustrations really illustrate, the maps are excellent, and the form is what one expects in a book by Clark.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON

The life and letters of Walter H. Page. By Burton J. Hendrick. In two volumes. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page and company, 1922. x, 436, viii, 437 p. $10.00)

Of the nearly nine hundred pages of these two volumes but one hundred and thirty are given to the period of Walter Page's life before he became the ambassador of the United States government near the Court of St. James in 1913. The work becomes, then, *The life and letters,* with particular emphasis on the letters, of five years. Interest in the war and in things pertaining to it undoubtedly caused such a division, and relegated to a position of comparative insignificance the doings of a really important person over a period of almost sixty years. One chapter sketches the "Reconstruction boyhood" of a North Carolinian born not quite six years before the outbreak of the civil war. Mr. Page's career as a journalist, editor and publisher, and man of

affairs takes two more chapters, while a fourth, entitled "The Wilsonian era begins," links the man of letters with the political game and with the new administration. Two-thirds, then, of the first volume and all the second are left for the ambassadorship.

In considering such a production as this there are two points of view which must be maintained separately, yet two points which are likely to become confused. In the first place there are the letters and other documents from Mr. Page's hand; in the second place there is the connective tissue supplied by the compiler. The documents, which must be assumed to be a fair sample of the greater mass from which they were culled, form a part of the raw material of history. They add certain facts to those already available. They picture the personal reaction of a man to a highly important and very interesting series of events. Criticism of this material, in the ordinary sense of the term, cannot be made, although comment on its content may be well in place.

From Mr. Page's letters the reader soon gains, as President Wilson appears to have done, the impression of a man thoroughly American, who found himself intensely sympathetic with, yet at times unsparingly critical of, the people among whom he represented his country. So long as the world was at peace such an attitude could not fail to build higher the structure of good understanding between the two English-speaking countries. When war came the situation changed. Not for an instant was there any doubt in Mr. Page's mind about the rights of the case; he was, of course, forced to be neutral in his public expressions of sentiment in England, but his letters reveal the fact that his was at heart a benevolent neutrality. He found his task of urging upon the British government the "cases" arising out of the blockade, shipment of goods ostensibly to neutral countries, and the like, very onerous. He was unable to perceive why his government was inclined to make as much fuss about the diverting of a cargo of merchandise as it did over the torpedoing of a vessel. In short, he felt very keenly that the whole war was a struggle between forces which made for advancing civilization and those which would turn back the hands of the clock, and he deplored the administration's failure to see the matter as he did.

Mr. Page was wholly out of sympathy with President Wilson's course during much of the time while the United States was a neutral, and he did not hesitate to deliver himself of his inmost thoughts to his intimate friends and to those, like Colonel House, who were close to the administration. His communications to the president, while less blunt, were very nearly as frank.

One feels, when reading the letters Mr. Page wrote, say between the early part of 1915 and the latter part of 1916, that he had to some extent lost touch with affairs in his own country, that, in his inability to gauge from London the temper of the diverse peoples of the United States, he was harsh and sometimes unjust in his estimate of the course of events at home. Harsh, but apparently not unjust were his reflections upon the conduct of the department of state, especially under the ministrations of Mr. Bryan.

The letters are of unquestioned value in helping to form an estimate of the forces at work during those five eventful years. Taken by themselves they render vivid but at times distorted testimony; checked by other sources they are illuminating.

When one turns to the contribution of Mr. Hendrick in supplying the "life" there arises the feeling that a greater service would have been done if the letters alone had been published. Mr. Page was not writing history; he said what he felt in his letters, and his reader may disagree with his point of view, with his interpretation of events, and there let the matter rest. But Mr. Hendrick purports to write history, or what amounts to the same thing in a more or less limited field, when he adds explanatory matter or sketches events to give a setting. In doing so he has fallen into the pit so often waiting for the feet of biographers, the pit of eulogistic, uncritical partisanship. This is the more regrettable because Mr. Hendrick writes well and easily, not to say persuasively.

LESTER BURRELL SHIPPEE

The farm bureau movement. By Orville Merton Kile. With an introduction by James Raley Howard. (New York: The Macmillan company, 1921. xiv, 282 p. $2.00)

One is inclined to liken *The farm bureau movement* to what a biography of a young man might be, written at about his commencement age by a very appreciative cousin or aunt meaning to be kindly critical. The American farm bureau federation was still in its second year when the book was written. Mr. Kile had been for some time assistant representative in the Washington office of the federation. With high seriousness he takes his subject: "It is generally conceded," he says, "that a collapse of the farm bureau movement would set agriculture back in this country a half century" (page 277). But did not President Howard open the convention of the federation in April, 1921, at which the grain marketing committee made its report, with these memorable words: "This morning . . . marks sun-up for American Agriculture"? Truly the twenty months that have lapsed since then have given much perspective to the farm bureau movement.

Mr. Kile explains, however, that his purpose was not primarily to write a history of the movement, but rather to explain it and present its underlying purposes and principles, first, to "those non-agricultural groups who may have either a business, political or a social interest" in it, and second, to its vast unassimilated membership. As such, the book is well done, is well organized, and has a good selection of material. Part 1 gives the background of the movement and sums up in brief fashion the earlier farmers' movements and the growth of the county agent system. The next two sections trace the development of the federation and its early activities. The fourth section analyzes its strengths and weaknesses, and the last section relates the movement to our national life.

Historians and readers in general will find most valuable the explanation of how the farm bureau movement grew out of the county agent system (pages 62-124) and that of its present relationship to it (pages 211-221); for this relationship is indeed involved, so involved that even Mr. Kile, who indorses the arrangement, admits that it is due for some modifications.

The analysis of the weaknesses of the farm bureau movement is also valuable; but it misses a number of important considerations, or else leaves them to be read between the lines. Of course under the circumstances the author could not usually be specific. The last section betrays, as one would expect, a considerable lack of grasp of the operation of broad underlying economic forces.

J. D. Black

The letters of Franklin K. Lane, personal and political. With illustrations. Edited by Anne Wintermute Lane and Louise Herrick Wall. (New York and Boston: Houghton Mifflin company, 1922. xxiv, 473 p. $5.00)

Everybody has to throw a stone at any great man in America who really brings things to pass. The author of these letters or perhaps the editors felt the same impulse that Secretaries Garrison and Lansing and a thousand others had felt, and they joined the procession. And the publisher's advertising man thought a good round attack on the broken and ill ex-president would sell their book, and consequently the press of the country a little while ago carried front-page articles describing the occasions and the personal disagreements which showed how another "high-minded man" had found it impossible to live on decent terms with Woodrow Wilson.

The reviewer, therefore, hastened to read the volume to see if the publishers did really have a scandal. There were two chapters of

letters to close personal friends covering cabinet discussions in war time. These chapters show first and most distinctly that Lane himself was a bad adviser to the president; that his friends were frequently, if not generally, hostile to the administration of which he was a member; that Wilson's cabinet, like the cabinets of Washington, Jackson, and Lincoln, was almost evenly divided on most great questions; and that Wilson, like his predecessors, followed his own counsel. The wisdom of this is made plain indeed by Lane, who condemns it. That Lane could believe that the Germans in 1917 compelled Americans in Berlin to submit to an acid bath before leaving the country shows how unbalanced his mind had become. And when, at the end of the war, he condemns Wilson for poking fun at his cabinet when it urged, upon unanimous vote, a continuation of the war till Germany had been devastated, he only shows what I have said, namely, that he was a bad counselor. It was Lincoln who upbraided Sumner in 1865 because at the end of the civil war the latter still wished to continue the methods of war. Apparently "the great men" of all countries think the best way to make an end of a war is to continue war. Lane was one of these, as, indeed, it seems from the chapters in mind the rest of the Wilson cabinet were.

So I found the chapters on cabinet secrets, the condemnation by a cabinet member of his chief, as promised by the newspapers, but there is no effective attack upon Wilson. Whatever the faults of Wilson, he was not wrong in ignoring the wishes of his cabinet in the war crisis. Of course one needs to guard against this book as a final story of cabinet attitudes. Lane was growing sour; he apparently was ill; and he felt the sting of poverty as he approached the end of his career. There will be other letters and diaries bearing upon the conduct and policy of that momentous leadership.

But let us turn to the better and wiser Lane. Lane was a California democrat who could win votes from republicans; he was one of those house-cleaners of his state who attracted the favorable opinion of President Roosevelt; and because of this he was made a member of the interstate commerce commission in 1906. He became at once the most important member of that body. It was his connection with the commission, as well as the fact that he represented "the coast," that gave him his seat in the Wilson cabinet. But Lane was never a democrat in the sense that Daniels or Wilson was. He entertained the view that clever leaders like Roosevelt and himself must somehow keep the people from making fools of themselves. The idea, famous in American history, that democracy was never really meant in earnest, he was never quite able to banish from his mind. His friends were, as a rule, of the same type.

Roosevelt, not Lincoln, was his model; and the difference is fundamental. I have found only one name in all his correspondence, that of James H. Barry of San Francisco, that connotes real faith in democracy. His very love of William James and his pragmatism is indicative of the bent of mind, pragmatism — "what you can get away with." The people will do for a plebiscite; but never for a responsible, guiding power in any country. Perhaps he was right. Most distinguished Americans have ever been of his way of thinking.

But what delightful friends his were! Benjamin Ide Wheeler, E. M. House, Frank Cobb, Robert Lansing, Adolf Miller, and Walton Moore. Anyone who knows these men knows that Lane must have been a man of charm, even genius — only one half of these would veto what the other half voted, possibly the right kind of a group to stimulate one's thought.

The historian will be interested in the account (pages 260-261) of the way Alaska was purchased. The president of the Riggs national bank told Lane and others (and produced evidence) at a dinner in 1911 that the Russian demonstration made in favor of the United States in 1862 was financed secretly by order of President Lincoln. It was all done through the old Corcoran, or Riggs national bank, and neither congress nor the country was to know anything about the matter. When the war ended and there was no way to secure the money from congress for "war purposes," Alaska was purchased for $1,400,000 and the remainder of the purchase money, $5,800,000, was added to cover the cost of the demonstration! Secret diplomacy. Gradually we learn more of the subterfuges and corruption of the civil war period. It was Dunning who showed that $200,000 of the $7,200,000 was added to the price of Alaska to cover the cost of inducing Thaddeus Stevens and others to vote the funds for putting the treaty into effect.

I have indicated that these letters are interesting and important, although they do not prove just what their author and the editors may have wished them to prove. There is another point. Few men wrote more brilliant letters than Secretary Lane. He was a frank and rather well-informed philosopher. In one of the letters to Elizabeth (page 392) he says:

> Your telegram lures as your letter did. But such pleasures are not for us, because of our sins. "And those that are *good* shall be happy!" Work. Work. Work. It is the One Supreme. It keeps us from being foolish, and doing as fools do. It is needed for the mastery of a world that has its destiny written, as surely as we have ours. It is a chain and a pair of wings; it binds and it releases. It is the master of the creature and the tool of the Creator. It is hell, and it lifts us out

of hell and into heaven. It was not known in Paradise, but there could be no Paradise without it. A curse and a Savior.

There was something very gay and very solemn at the same time in Lane. He enjoyed his fighting life; he had many friends and he loved them. His letters are gems. There must be many others. If he was sometimes impractical and sometimes a little too free among the bitterest enemies of his own chief and the country's leader in a trying period, he was withal a remarkable and a lovable man, one of the best of his day.

WILLIAM E. DODD

Mormon settlement in Arizona. By James H. McClintock, state historian of Arizona. (Phoenix: The manufacturing stationers, inc., 1921. 307 p. $2.10)

This volume treats in a popular style of the pioneer work of the "latter-day saints," or Mormons, in the agricultural development of Arizona. The author, James H. McClintock, was for many years the editor of one of the leading newspapers of Arizona and for the past four years has served as state historian. The material is largely drawn from interviews by the writer, from narratives, letters, and diaries of the men who took part in the movement, supplemented by the records of the local Mormon churches as well as those of the central organization in Salt Lake City. Throughout, the author stresses the importance of two vital factors, that of coöperation among the settlers secured through their church organization, and that of vigor of action due to their personal habits of simplicity and temperance.

The value of the book is in the analysis of the southward migrations of the Mormons, which shows that the settlements in Arizona form an integral part of the general movement of the "saints" in the west. The work of the Mormon battalion during the Mexican war in the occupation of New Mexico and California was part of the initial phase of pioneer exploration for favorable locations in the new territory. Following the decision to locate the central organization in Utah, looking to the foundation of the state of Deseret to include practically all of the basin of the Colorado with an economic basis of agriculture by irrigation, this southern movement was inaugurated. Missionaries led by the intrepid Hamblin, who won the friendship of the Paiute and Navaho, paved the way. Beginning with the unfortunate occupation of the Virgin and Muddy valleys, then included in Arizona, migration pushed south of the Grand cañon to the valley of the Little Colorado, from there to the Salt and Gila valleys, and later to the San Pedro valley with other groups in the northern Mexican states. The struggle of the planting is well told, but the slow development remains untraced.

Though somewhat loosely organized, the book is valuable as an initial work describing agricultural beginnings in Arizona. A chronology of the period aids materially in giving unity. The serviceable index, many illustrations, photographs, and maps add greatly to the importance of the work. A list of place names is especially helpful, since many of the settlements are no longer in existence and others have changed names. It is disappointing to the historian, however, because few references are given in sufficient detail to aid him in the further use of the mass of material which the author had at his command.

IDA C. REID

History of the Latin-American nations. By William Spence Robertson. (New York and London: D. Appleton and company, 1922. vii, 617 p. $4.00).

Professor Robertson follows custom by devoting his opening chapter to the physical background and the Indian. Perhaps he introduces too much detail about the latter for textbook purposes, but at this point the accompanying map will do much to clarify the text. His chapter on the European background is an adequate review of fundamental conditions in Spain and Portugal — to both of which he gives full and impartial treatment — and prepares the reader for his study of colonial institutions. After all, these are only transported products of the home land, jealously guarded from foreign contamination and little changed in the new environment — at least while Spain controlled their destiny. His chapter on discovery and conquest is well condensed and properly introduces us to the chief characters and the leading geographical areas. The two chapters on the Spanish colonial period constitute one of the best brief studies yet vouchsafed us. They are institutional rather than narrative in treatment, but all essential topics receive attention. The author manages to put into less than forty pages the subject of the wars of independence. This is a marvel of condensing and self-restraint, when we remember the multiplicity of his previous writings on this period.

Up to this point the author has used about a third of his space. Here his trouble really begins, for his fellow craftsmen will have as many separate theories as to subsequent treatment as there are individual workers. Practice, sanctioned by the compelling example of Garciá Calderón and of Shepherd, prescribes one or two chapters to introduce the national period in Hispanic American history. Of course we realize that a growing nationality marks the development of each of our southern neighbors and that this factor needs to be emphasized as soon as possible, but at the same time there are certain factors that are common to large sections or to all, and these can best be treated before taking

up the story of the individual countries. In fact such introduction will clinch the essential points in that story. The author has preferred to follow the contrary course, and at the expense of a little repetition. He has thereby gained in clearness, but the instructor must do effective *liaison* service. That, however, is the instructor's task.

Brazil for once receives adequate space. One need no longer conceive of the southern continent as made up exclusively of Spanish territory or be in doubt about the vernacular of its greatest republic. Each of her continental fellows receives a separate chapter heading, and so does Mexico, and the same attention is judged sufficient for the island republics and Central America taken together. Then two chapters conclude the narrative — one being devoted to "Problems and ideals" and the other to "Relations with other states." In a measure these replace the usual introductory chapters mentioned above. In all, due space — some may say undue space — is given to governmental details.

As a compendium of facts one will find little to criticize in the volume. There are a few infelicitous expressions and obvious slips, apparently inevitable even with a scholar of Robertson's reputation. More serious from the teaching standpoint are the occasional paragraphs where facts are crowded in with very little regard to relationship, previous reference, or logical continuity. Students, and even instructors, will find these passages hard to handle. The author also falls into the specialist's mistake of introducing too many minor facts and useless names. He might to advantage more often adopt the rôle of interpreter. His book is a good chronicle. The publishers, however, have not given him maps in keeping with the text.

The excellencies far outweigh these minor defects. The author's knowledge is encyclopedic and accurate. His familiarity with life and physical conditions in these countries saves him from many a pitfall and adds to the interest and credibility of his story. His suggestions for readings reveal the scholar's touch and frequent association with kindred-minded Hispanists. The book is a boon to scholars and an acceptable general treatise which will have a usefulness outside the limits of the United States, but here it will do its best service. Taken in connection with two or three other volumes that have recently appeared in the field of Pan-American relations it will contribute the basis of fact upon which they all and similar publications must depend for their continuing usefulness.

Isaac Joslin Cox

The transition of a typical frontier. With illustrations from the life of Henry Hastings Sibley, fur trader, first delegate in congress from Minnesota territory, and first governor of the state of Minnesota. By Wilson Porter Shortridge. (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta publishing company, 1922. v, 186 p. $1.50)

This monograph is one of the best illustrations of Ranke's saying: "The form is determined by the material." It is a history of Minnesota in terms of the major activities of General Sibley, whose papers the author exploited; and, while the outline of that history is somewhat lacking in amplitude, it is surprisingly logical. The chapter heads epitomize the story. They are: "A type of the New England element in the west," "The fur traders' frontier," "Pioneer days on the upper Mississippi," "The making of a new territory," "Territorial politics," "The needs of a new territory," "The Indian problem on the frontier," "Territorial growth and the organization of a state," "The advent of the railroad," "The last stand of the Sioux," and "Pioneer dreams come true." In the fur trade, the movement for a new territory, territorial politics, state politics, railroad matters, Indian affairs, and civilization building after the removal of the Indian menace, General Sibley was not merely a prominent participant but an acknowledged leader. To a degree rarely equaled, the dynamic process which carried the community in the space of fifty years from the primitive to the cosmopolitan was in this case matched by the process which developed a naturally able man, of strong native character and impressive personality, from fur-trader to statesman and man of large affairs. He was successively territorial delegate to congress, president of the constitutional convention, governor of the state, military commander in the Sioux war. At all stages of his career, Sibley was also immersed in business affairs on a large scale, and these, in some cases, affected his relations to the public.

"The aim of this study," says the author, "has not only been to follow the life of Sibley, but also to attempt to portray, as he and other pioneers saw it, the gradual evolution of society and industry in the upper Mississippi country." The theme is well conceived and wrought out in scholarly fashion. The author has performed careful research on the main topics; his conclusions are sane and enlightening. In large measure he has avoided the temptation which so easily besets the biographer of making an impeccable hero of his subject, and while this book will probably not be the last word on the violent controversies in which Sibley bore a part, it leaves the reader open-minded toward any new evidence which may be presented. Yet the book, while in this respect

better than the average biography, is something less than a critical study of a career aiming at rigorously just and final conclusions. It is in spirit a tribute to a distinguished citizen. The reader is almost never quite sure how far Sibley's acts were dictated by regard for the public weal and how far they were influenced by business, political, and personal considerations.

But the biographical feature of the book is subordinated, in the author's treatment, to the historical, and as a history of Minnesota's emergence from the primitive the work can be highly commended.

The theme possesses epic possibilities, but these have been only partially realized. The style is that of the monographist rather than the seasoned writer. A good many errors were missed by the proof reader. I know of no authority for the middle initial "M" in Henry Dodge's name (page 42). Page 57 has "member" for "number"; page 70 has "countries" for "counties" in two successive lines; and there are other typographical slips which ought to have been eliminated. Fortunately, there are few statements of fact to which exception can be taken, and after all deductions have been made, on the grounds mentioned, the little book is a distinct and valuable contribution to the literature of frontier history; and without reaching a high plane of literary excellence, it is a virile, interesting book to read.

JOSEPH SCHAFER

Charles Sealsfield, ethnic elements and national problems in his works. By B. A. Uhlendorf. Reprinted from "Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter," Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois-Jahrgang 1920-21, volumes 20-21. (Chicago: Deutsch-Amerikanische historische Gesellschaft von Illinois, 1922. viii, 242 p.)

The author's conviction that the writings of Karl Anton Postl under the name of Charles Sealsfield constitute an important contribution to the writing of American history brought forth this monograph, which has all the earmarks of tireless research. Sealsfield is presented as a student of history, an original thinker of unusual depth, steeped in the fundamental principles of Herder's philosophy of history, a keen observer of the historical process on the frontier in the southwest in the twenties and thirties, who formulated and in a way accomplished "the task which Professor Turner set to American historiography" many years later. In view of the fact that Sealsfield's name is all but unknown to the historical profession in this country, it would appear that Mr. Uhlendorf has allowed his enthusiasm for his "find" to overpower his sober judgment.

The monograph is a detailed study of passages portraying American types, describing social, political, economic, and religious conditions, and offering philosophical reflections, in the novels of the son of a German-Moravian farmer and wine-grower, whose unhappy life in the Roman Catholic priesthood drove him a fugitive to America, where he found a very hopeful situation in contrast with Metternich-ridden Europe. These novels appeared in the years 1834 and 1843. The scope of Sealsfield's writings is indicated by the chapter headings of the monograph: "Colonization," "Relation of Indians to the white race," "Great historical events," (revolutionary war, Louisiana purchase, second war with England, Texas revolution, three great statesmen — Washington, Monroe, Jefferson), "Liberty and equality," "General retrogression politically, economically, and socially," "Kentuckians," "Backwoods settlers," "The French element and the American planter in Louisiana," "Negroes and slavery," "The German element," "New York and New England types," and "National character." As a piece of research carefully and critically executed, Mr. Uhlendorf's study justifies itself, but it adds very little to what was already known. Sealsfield's scrupulous care to conceal his German origin prevented him from writing what might have been a real contribution to the history of German immigration. Mr. Uhlendorf asserts that the novels stimulated the desire in the German heart to emigrate to America; but he offers no proof, other than that they were written in German and appeared at a time of political and social unrest.

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON

New viewpoints in American history. By Arthur M. Schlesinger. (New York: The Macmillan company, 1922. 299 p. $2.40)

Mr. Schlesinger's *New viewpoints in American history* is an excellent illustration of the fact that the historian does not rise above his fellow beings in seeing the world through his own eyes. We all have our prejudices, which we excuse as our "points of view" and dignify by the magic word "interpretation." In this volume Mr. Schlesinger in a very scholarly fashion depicts some of the prejudices current among students of American history. The twelve chapter, or rather essay, titles suggest at first an equal number of "viewpoints," but a reading of the book itself dispels that notion. Only six such viewpoints, namely, the racial, the geographic, the economic, the legalistic, the philosophic, and the feministic, are clearly brought out by the author.

The first and second chapters of the volume deal respectively with the first two opposing interpretations of American history. In attempting to explain why we are what we are, the follower of the former

theory will allege that we are a nation of immigrants and that our civilization is largely the result of the blending into one composite whole of the different peoples who came to our shores. But scarcely has he finished when the disciple of the geographic interpretation of American history will say that the reason for the immigrant's developing a civilization different from that of his brethren in Europe is to be found in the different surroundings here, such as soil, climate, and frontier conditions in general. Therefore American history should be studied from the geographic rather than from other points of view.

Both of these theories must take back seats upon the arrival of the economic viewpoint. For such is the latter's domineering position, that the entire volume may, in some respects, be considered a discussion of the economic interpretation of American history. While this bias permeates every viewpoint, nevertheless six chapters, or about half of the book, are almost exclusively devoted to the development of the economic only. These cover the entire period of American history since the discovery, and follow paths beaten by Lybyer, Turner, the author himself, and Beard.

Perhaps the two most significant chapters of this series are those dealing with "The foundations of the modern era" and "The riddle of the parties." In the first of these Mr. Schlesinger very brilliantly suggests the colonial period, that from the revolution to the civil war, and the one since the great struggle, as parallels to the ancient, medieval, and modern periods of world history. The threescore years since the great rebellion are completely dominated by the economic revolution and therefore political fracases are mere gewgaws when compared with changes wrought on our lives by the somewhat tardy arrival of the industrial revolution. Consequently, the author is talking to a sympathetic audience when he joyfully exclaims that "the historians are beginning to give less attention to Southern reconstruction and more to Northern reconstruction, since the financial and industrial reorganization of the North has proved to be of greater enduring importance" (page 249).

Economic change produced havoc in political alignments. Conditions changed but political organizations did not, and therefore the real struggle goes on among the different sections within the party who share nothing in common save the roof of a traditional party name. No wonder, then, that "the progressive wings of the opposite parties have more points of similarity than the opposite wings of the same party" (page 281).

While the racial and geographic viewpoints receive prominence, and the economic one dominance, the legalistic and philosophic factors are

not overlooked by the author. The chapter dealing with the former is especially valuable in dispelling the notion that South Carolina has been the only sinner in trying to disrupt the national government, and treats American history as a struggle between the central and state governments.

The philosophic viewpoint represents those who regard history as a struggle between the old and the new. "From one point of view," says the author, "American History may be regarded as a succession of new generations ruthlessly elbowing aside older and effete generations" (page 113). The discussion of this attitude toward history is particularly good in the essay on "Radicalism and conservatism in American history" and may be criticized for its brevity only. This is particularly true of the part assigned to American history; and almost to the very end of the chapter the reader wonders why the discussion, though so thought-provoking, has been brought into a book of this nature.

Probably the "newest" of the new viewpoints is the feministic, or the one discussed in the essay entitled "The rôle of women in American history." The author very pertinently remarks that, according to the standard histories, it is doubtful whether women have ever contributed anything worthy of record; one might go a step farther and even doubt the very existence of women in America so far as our textbooks are concerned. Mr. Schlesinger succeeds very well in his purpose in showing the significant participation of the "weaker sex" in the affairs of the nation. Frontier life, the revolutionary and civil wars, as well as the modern reform movements testify to the tremendous, the unrecognized, importance of the part played by women in the affairs of the nation. This femaleological interpretation of American history is particularly significant since it reveals a tale of woe and oppression practiced by one half of the human family over the other. One feels despondent at this thought because it sets a bad precedent and justifies a vengeful attitude on the part of the women as they are rapidly coming into their own. Perhaps all will yet be well, and woman may once more show her tolerant rather than her vindictive side. Nevertheless man ought to sit up and take notice and, from the sheer motive of self-protection, should not lose a moment's time in becoming the stoutest champion of equal rights for both sexes.

On the whole, Mr. Schlesinger's very illuminating volume marks a significant departure from traditional American historiography. Though in outline form, it is perhaps the most serious attempt at the organization of American social history, and let us hope it is only the herald of future arrivals. Though primarily intended for the student,

the book is quite comprehensible to the layman, who will carry away from it impressions far worthier and more lasting than from the average textbook. If we are to quarrel with the author at all, it would be along the line of organization rather than that of content. The volume might prove to be more effective if it were organized to present a number of viewpoints rather than a series of essays. A number of chapters might have to be broken up and used to reënforce others, but that would not detract from the value of the book. As a matter of fact, the breaking up of the essay on "The decline of aristocracy" and using its fragments to support the economic and geographic viewpoints would be very effective.

The book is undoubtedly a product of the "new history" and has as its ideal the understanding of life in the present through a study of that of the past. History in the hands of such men as the author becomes not a chronicle of the lives of men or of nations, but a study of the life of man.

EDWARD M. COHEN

History of Indiana. By Logan Esarey. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and company, 1922. xii, 362 p.)

This book has been written for use as a text evidently in the seventh or eighth grades of the elementary school. It is representative of the new order of state histories for schools that is rapidly displacing the old. That means at least four things. First, the book is devoted largely to the social, economic, intellectual, and religious phases, instead of to the political and military. Of the thirty-one chapters, only nine are given to politics and war. Second, the method of treatment is topical instead of chronological. Third, there is no attempt to exalt unduly the "greatness" of Indiana and Indianians. The story of the state and its people is told sanely and in good literary style. Fourth, the author has followed the principle that state history should be studied in connection with our national history for the purpose of getting the proper historical setting, and in the suggestions given at the close of each chapter, he frequently refers to specific sections or chapters in one of the standard textbooks in American history suitable for the seventh or eighth grades with the recommendation that these sections or chapters should be read in connection with the topics in Indiana history under consideration. In these suggestions the author has also given references to standard works and published source material on Indiana history for further reading. Unless, however, the school children of Indiana are more highly favored than those of other states, these citations will prove largely gratuitous and useless.

There is one feature in this book that the reviewer has not seen in any other school state history. Appended to each chapter is a reprint of some official document pertaining to the history of Indiana, or an extract from the journal, diary, or personal recollections of some Indiana pioneer, or an excerpt from some noteworthy work on Indiana history. These appendixes ought to be very illuminating to the young readers for whom the book is intended. A few words of introduction, however, to some of the extracts from journals, diaries, and recollections would have given them greater definiteness of meaning and would have added to their usefulness as illustrative material. Moreover, some of them do not fit very well where they are placed, as, for example, those appended to chapters 23, 28, and 29.

The book is well illustrated with pictures of historical scenes and characters and with maps and drawings. Many of the historical scenes appear, however, to be pictures from the centennial pageant held in Indiana in 1916, but, if that is the case, there is no word of explanation to that effect. There is, moreover, no map of Indiana later than 1833. A series of maps showing the increase in the number of counties in Indiana would have been very helpful and suggestive.

The order of the chapters does not always appear logical. It is quite satisfactory up to and including chapter 17. But thereafter the chapters are somewhat jumbled. Chapter 25 on "A political revolution" should have come between chapters 20 and 21, and chapter 22 on "A state school system" ought to have been placed after chapter 24. Moreover, chapter 28 on "State politics since 1860" should have come either before chapter 25 or after chapter 30. As the chapters now stand, the unity of thought and the continuity of the story are interrupted several times in the latter part of the book.

On the whole, the book is a very good piece of work and should prove very effective in the field for which it has been written.

E. M. Violette

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Edited by Lester B. Shippee

The annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association is to be held at Oklahoma City and Norman, Oklahoma, on March 29-31. The committee on arrangements has provided a most interesting program, the academic monotony of which is to be broken by lunches, dinners, and receptions. At a dinner tendered by the Oklahoma historical society on March 29, welcoming addresses will be given by the president of the local society and by the governor of the state. After these the president of the association, Mr. Solon J. Buck, will read his presidential address, "The future of history in the Mississippi valley." The next day at luncheon the speakers will be President Stratton D. Brooks and Dean J. S. Buchanan of the university.

The first session will open at ten o'clock on Thursday morning, March 29, and will be devoted to the subject of the southwestern border. The papers will be as follows: "The Louisiana-Texas frontier during the Aaron Burr conspiracy," by Mr. Isaac J. Cox; "Notes on the colonization of Texas," by Mr. Eugene C. Barker; "A filibustering expedition of 1836," by Miss Grace Nute; and "The St. Louis legion in the Mexican war," by Mr. E. M. Violette. At the afternoon session, Mr. Ralph P. Bieber will discuss "Some aspects of the Santa Fe trail, 1848-1880," and Miss Harriet Smither will give an account of "The English abolition movement and the annexation of Texas." These papers will be followed by one on "Southern railroads, 1850-1860," by Mr. R. S. Cotterill; one on "The winning of Kansas, 1854-1858," by Mr. Cornelius J. Brosnan; and one on "Voluntary military organizations just previous to the civil war," by Mr. T. G. Gronert.

To the morning session on Friday has been assigned the general topic of the Indians. The following papers will be read: "The Caddoan Indians of Oklahoma and adjacent states," by Mr. Joseph B. Thoburn; "Comanche civilization," by Mr. Daniel Becker; and "The spirit of Soonerland," by Mr. E. E. Dale. At the meeting of the history teachers' section in the afternoon there will be presented the following: "Community civics and the development of citizenship," by Mr. F. V. Abernathy; "Latin-American history in the high school," by Miss Floy Dawson; and "An interpretation of recent American history," by Mr. James C. Malin. The war between the states will receive attention in

the evening. At that session Miss Lucy Simmons will read a paper on "The relations of Sterling Price with Jefferson Davis"; Mr. David Y. Thomas will follow with a paper on "Kentucky and Missouri in the confederacy"; Mr. Fred A. Shannon will discuss "The mercenary factor in the creation of the union army, 1861-1865"; and Mr. Thomas P. Martin will read a paper on "Some questions in the history of Anglo-American relations, 1830-1865."

On Saturday morning there will be a meeting which will attract those interested in the promotion of local history. The papers will be: "Collecting and housing historical materials," by Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker; "Publication activities of a state historical society," by Mr. Benjamin F. Shambaugh; and "The state survey: its methods and possibilities," by Mr. Herbert A. Kellar. The discussion will be lead by Mr. Dallas T. Herndon and Mr. John W. Oliver. At the afternoon session three papers will be read: "The agricultural development of Colorado territory, 1858-1865," by Mr. J. L. Kingsbury; "The economic basis of the populist movement in Iowa," by Mr. H. C. Nixon; and "The genesis of the American steel navy, 1880-1890," by Mr. W. I. Brandt.

Plans are being made for an excursion at the close of the meeting to places of historic interest in Oklahoma.

The Michigan historical commission has published the "Prize essays written by pupils of Michigan schools in the local history contest for 1920-1921" as its *Bulletin* number 15. This essay contest was arranged by the Michigan organization of the Daughters of the American revolution and the Michigan state federation of women's clubs.

Professor Lawrence Henry Gipson of Wabash college has had reprinted his little pamphlet on *The historical monograph* which he uses as a manual to guide his students in undergraduate courses. The booklet has instructions on the methods of attacking a subject, of seeking and evaluating material, and of putting the finished product into proper form.

Two contributions of especial timeliness appear in the *American economic review* for December, 1922. One is the "Economic philosophy of co-operation" by E. G. Nourse of the Iowa state college, and the other "A unique situation in economic theory," by O. Fred Boucke. The third article of this number, by Shirley D. Southworth, discusses "Some recent problems in public utility valuation and regulation."

Jacob A. Swisher's "History of the organization of counties in Iowa" fills most of the October, 1922, issue of the *Iowa journal of history and*

politics. This article, as explained by the editor, supplements "the two monographs written by F. H. Garver on the *History of the establishment of counties in Iowa* and the *Boundary history of the counties of Iowa* which were published in the *Iowa journal of history and politics,* volumes VI and VII."

For November, 1922, the *Palimpsest* takes a plunge into recent history when it prints "That 1900 football team" by John Ely Briggs and "The world's series of 1891" by Chester H. Kirby. The December issue turns backward somewhat with "The passing of Homer" (the Iowa town, not the mythical Greek) by Bessie L. Lyon, and the story of "Pilot Grove" by O. A. Garretson.

In the October, 1922, *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* there is an account of "The McGuffey society at the Logan elm," and papers on the "Marion centennial celebration," by J. Wilbur Jacoby; "The story of a flag," by General J. Warren Keifer; and "Exploration of the Mound City group," by William C. Miles. This issue also has the index for volume 31 and one for the minutes of the thirty-seventh annual meeting of the society.

Fairfax Harrison publishes in the October, 1922, *Virginia magazine of history and biography* the story of "Western explorations in Virginia between Lederer and Spotswood" (a chapter from "Landmarks of Old Prince William"). The efforts of Cadwallader Jones, in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, form the subject of most of the paper. Jones's map, which depicts Lake "Illoinoise" and a part of the Ohio river to the northwest, is reproduced.

William G. Bek's tenth article on "The followers of Duden" appears in the *Missouri historical review* for October, 1922. Other articles in this number are "Alexander McNair," by Walter B. Stevens; "The Grand river country," by E. W. Stephens; "A true story of the border war," by B. F. Blankton; the fifth installment of Wiley Britton's "Pioneer life in southwest Missouri"; and "Shelby's expedition to Mexico," by John N. Edwards.

The second installment of Carl Brand's "Know-nothing party in Indiana" appears in the *Indiana magazine of history* for September, 1922. The presidential campaign of 1856 forms the thesis of this portion of the study. Other articles in this number are "Early normal schools, Ascension academy," by John C. Cheney; "Indiana primary laws," by J. F. Connell; "Crawford county," by H. H. Pleasant; and "The deportation of the Pottawattomies," by B. F. Stuart.

In *Minnesota historical news* for January, 1923, it is announced that "a series of influential letters written by Paul Hjelm-Hansen in 1869, describing an extensive journey in Otter Tail, Douglas, and other western counties, has been found, printed in an old newspaper, the *Nordisk Folkeblad*, the files of which are preserved by the Minnesota historical society." "The letters constitute a mine of detailed, first-hand information, useful and interesting to the student of settlement in Minnesota."

The *Pennsylvania magazine of history and biography* prints the first part of A. T. Volwiler's account of "George Croghan and the westward movement, 1741-1782." The author, who was Harrison research fellow at the University of Pennsylvania, made use of much manuscript material found in the library of the Historical society of Pennsylvania, and, judging by the account as far as it is carried in this number of the *Magazine*, has added something of importance to the knowledge of the region about the Ohio and Lake Erie in ante-revolution days.

An interesting little book by Mme. Adrien Loir entitled *Charles-Alexandre Lesueur, artiste et savante français en Amérique de 1816 á 1839* (Le Havre: Muséum d'histoire naturelle, 1920) contains a brief sketch of Lesueur's career in the United States and has reproductions of forty-two drawings which he made while in the country. Many of these drawings are of considerable value as depicting frontier scenes in various parts of the Mississippi valley. In the text is embodied some portion of Lesueur's own observations written down at the time.

One of the articles of general interest to all students of American history since the civil war in the *Hispanic American historical review* for November, 1922, is that by A. Curtis Wilgus on "James G. Blaine and the Pan-American movement." The other contributions to this issue are in the more specialized field of Latin-American history; they include "Some reflections on the Cabildo as an institution," by William Whatley Pierson, Jr.; "Social life in Brazil in the middle of the nineteenth century," by Gilberto Freyre; and "Spanish seamen in the new world during the colonial period," by Paul S. Taylor.

Warren K. Moorehead's recent volume, *A report on the archaeology of Maine* (Andover, Massachusetts: Andover press, 1922. 272 p. Maps and plates) deals mainly with the burials of the so-called "red paint people" and throws much light upon the customs of this prehistoric tribe. During the period covered by the report, from 1912 to 1921, the members of the survey party traveled at least fifty-five hundred miles, and the account is necessarily fragmentary as the investigators moved from

place to place. The book is well printed, profusely illustrated, and supplied with a table of contents, an index, and a bibliography.

In the double number of the *Journal of the Illinois state historical society* (April-July, 1921), the leading article is by T. E. Musselman on the "History of the birds of Illinois." Other contributions are "Lincoln as I knew him," by Charles S. Zane; "Abraham Lincoln in congress, 1847-1849," by Charles O. Paulin; "Pioneers of Macon county," by N. M. Baker; "Pioneers of Coles county," by Mrs. Joseph C. Dole; a "Brief history of David McCoy and family," by Edwin H. Van Patten; and "Camp Roosevelt, builder of boys," by Lillian Ewertsen. The *Journal* has published as a separate the index to volume 13, covering the numbers issued from April, 1920, to January, 1921.

The seventh *Yearbook of the Swedish historical society of America* (St. Paul, 1922) contains, in addition to accounts of routine business affairs of the organization, three contributions of particular interest to historians of the Mississippi valley. Judge Andrew Holt tells about "Characteristics of the early Swedish settlers in Minnesota." George M. Stephenson writes "Some footnotes to the history of Swedish immigration from about 1855 to about 1865," and also prints a series of "Typical 'America letters,'"—letters written by Swedish immigrants, settled in Illinois and Iowa, to relatives and friends in the old country. The letters are published both in the original and in translation.

The *William and Mary college quarterly* for October, 1922, prints a series of documents emanating from democratic societies of Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky in 1793 and 1794. These documents, which are transcripts from manuscripts possessed by the Library of congress, deal particularly with the distress caused by the closure of the Mississippi by the Spaniards. Some of them are resolutions adopted by one society and sent for approval to others; some, general addresses to citizens; and one, a "Remonstrance of the citizens west of the Alleghany mountains," directed to "The president and congress of the United States of America." These papers bear witness to the intense interest westerners had in the unencumbered navigation of the Mississippi, and to their belief that congress was sectional in its outlook and inclined to ignore the complaints of citizens dwelling between the Appalachians and the river.

The double number of the *Michigan history magazine* for 1922 (no months specified) contains a long list of articles on a number of topics, with a poem or two inserted to give variety. Most of the contributions

are reminiscences or biographical sketches. "L. O. W." furnishes an account of the "Source material of the Detroit public library as supplied by the acquisition of the Burton historical collection," in which he deals largely with the manuscripts which are included in this collection. (Perhaps some of these documents will appear from time to time in this magazine.) In "What about Michigan archeology?" George R. Fox tells what has been printed on the subject and laments that so little has yet been done in so important a field, but suggests what might be done to stimulate research. Harry Beets's account of "Dutch journalism in Michigan" contains a list of Dutch newspapers and periodicals.

La question de la Louisiane, 1796-1806, by F. P. Renaut, appeared originally in the *Revue de l'histoire des colonies français* in 1918. It has been reprinted as a book of 242 pages and is to be added to the list of the works dealing with the matter of the Louisiana purchase. While the text brings out no new or startling facts or conclusions the book is a convenience since it reprints several of the important documents not always easily accessible. Among these are "Instructions données au général Pérignon par le directoire à la date du 20 messidor An IV," "Traité conclu entre la France et l'Espagne à la date du 27 Juin 1796," as well as the "Projet de traité proposé par le directoire exécutif à la date du 8 juillet 1796," "Traité préliminaire et secret conclu à Saint-Ildefonse, le 1er octobre 1800 entre la France et l'Espagne," "Rapport de Talleyrand à l'Empereur au sujet du 'Mémoire sur les Florides' remis par Monroe," and "Rapport de M. de le Prince de Talleyrand à l'Empereur Napoléon."

Joseph J. Thompson supplies two of the articles in the *Illinois Catholic historical review* of July, 1922. These are "Along the historic Illinois," and a continuation of the study of "The Illinois part of the diocese of Vincennes." Milo M. Quaife has a contribution to the discussion of "Points in Illinois history," which was found in the April issue of this magazine. Mr. Quaife comments on such moot "points" as "Who were the first white men to reach the Illinois country and the Illinois and Mississippi rivers?" "Is there any foundation for the belief that a serious quarrel existed between La Salle and the members of the Jesuit order?" "The origin of the name Chicago," and the "Location of Father Pinet's mission of the Guardian Angel." Other articles in this number are "Missionary adventurers among the Peorias," by the Reverend J. B. Culemans; "Colonel John Montgomery," by William A. Mese; "Claude Jean Allouez — Jesuit pioneer missionary," by William Stetson Merrill; and "The church of Naperville," by the Reverend Henry Liebang.

The Library of congress has discontinued publication of lists of manuscript accessions as appendixes of the annual reports, but it has issued a little pamphlet entitled *Accessions of manuscripts, broadsides and British transcripts* (Government printing office, 1922), which supplements the *Handbook of manuscripts in the Library of congress* (Government printing office, 1918) and the appendixes of the annual reports from 1917 to 1920 inclusive. Among the manuscript accessions of interest in a general way and especially to the student of western history are the letter books of President Grant, 1869-1877, and some Grant letters, a list of the proprietors of the Illinois and Wabash land company, a list of inhabitants of the Atascosito district of Texas in 1826, some letters of Governor John Sevier to William Blount, the papers of John Cabell Breckinridge, 1880 to 1904, a few Clay letters, some typewritten copies of letters written by Andrew Jackson to John Coffee and others between 1804 and 1845, a few more Johnson letters, and a couple of Polk letters.

One of the by-products of the Wisconsin domesday survey appears in the December, 1922, number of the *Wisconsin magazine of history*. This is an article by the editor, Joseph Schafer, in which he discusses "The Yankee and the Teuton in Wisconsin: characteristic attitudes toward the land." Mr. Schafer, using material which has been brought to light by the surveys, supplemented by other records, reaches the conclusion that the reasons why "Yankees," principally the genuine ones but generally all native Americans, settled in one kind of region and the Germans in another are more or less clear and understandable. "The Yankees, more speculative to the last, more imaginative and space-free, pressed ever towards the borders of the primitive, drawn by the same lure of wealth quickly and easily acquired which brought many of them to the prairies of Wisconsin in the earlier days. The Germans, fearing distance more than debt, confident in their ability to make grain crops grow and farm stock fatten if only they had a sure market for cattle and for crops, remained behind to till the abandoned fields and occupy the deserted homes." In the same issue is a continuation of Frederick J. Starin's "Diary of a journey to Wisconsin in 1840"; a fourth installment of General King's "Memories of a busy life"; and papers on "Lawrence college," by Samuel Plantz; "The electric light system at Appleton," by Louise P. Kellogg; and an account of "Beaver creek valley, Monroe county," by Doane Robinson.

Nearly all the November, 1922, number of the *Historical outlook* is given up to Harry Elmer Barnes's paper read at the annual meeting of the American historical association held at St. Louis in 1921. The paper,

on "The significance of sociology for the 'new' or synthetic history," is followed by a report of the discussion which was participated in by J. F. Rippy, M. S. Handman, W. B. Bodenhafer, and J. E. Gillespie. The December issue is edited by Professor Edgar Dawson and contains the "Annual summary statement of the plans and progress of the National council for the social studies." The "summary statement" includes the formulation of the "characteristic elements of the social studies"; that for history was prepared by Henry Johnson, for government by Mr. Dawson, and for economics by L. C. Marshall; for sociology two statements were prepared, one by R. L. Finney and E. C. Hayes, the other by F. H. Giddings; so also were two formulations for geography, one by W. W. Atwood and one by J. R. Smith. The number contains further papers on the "Pennsylvania program of social studies," by J. Lynn Barnard; "The place of the social studies in the high schools of Missouri," by Caroline E. Hartwig; "Progressive tendencies of state history teaching," by Harry L. Haun; "An attainable program of social studies for the high school," by Howard C. Hill; "Teachers for democracy," by A. F. Lange; and "The present status of state history teaching in the elementary grades," by Mr. Haun. The last-mentioned paper contains a useful tabulation of the exact situation with respect to the teaching of state history in all the commonwealths of the union.

In the summer session of Columbia university, July 9 to August 17, Professor Emile Bourgeois, secretary of the peace conference and professor of modern diplomatic and political history in the University of Paris, will give a course on European history in the nineteenth century with particular emphasis on French history. He will also participate in a series of lectures on French civilization.